

The
American Historical Review

EARLY RECORDS OF THE KING'S COUNCIL.¹

THE early history of the privy council is a subject that has been left in much obscurity. This is largely because there have seemed to be no records of its acts and proceedings before the reign of Richard II. While much concerning the council of the fourteenth century may be gathered from various collateral sources, it has seemed to some that in the lack of more direct evidence our knowledge of the subject cannot be clear and definite.² It has been thought too that the council can not be considered a distinct and mature body before the beginning of its records. Says Dicey, "The conjecture is therefore natural that the council's acts were first accurately recorded when its existence as a separate institution was for the first time recognized."³ This time was understood to be the reign of Richard II., which has been taken as marking a special change in the council's development.⁴ Much therefore hinges upon the question when such records were actually first made.

The famous collection of Sir Harris Nicolas, entitled *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, contains for its first entry a record of the tenth year of Richard II. That the same eminent author and editor subsequently discovered two isolated instances of council minutes of earlier date, belonging to the years 1337 and 1341 respectively, which he presented in his *History of the Royal*

¹ The term *king's council* rather than *privy council* was generally used in the fourteenth and most of the fifteenth century.

² "Its history can only be traced in its proceedings and until those proceedings are collected and printed, he [the author] is persuaded that anything which could be written would be unworthy of attention, because it must be formed of speculations founded upon most imperfect premises." Nicolas, *Proceedings of the Privy Council*, Vol. I., p. vi.

³ Dicey, *Privy Council*, p. 25.

⁴ "The privy council, from the reign of Richard II. onwards, although it inherited and amplified the functions of the permanent council of Edward I., differed widely in its organization." Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, II. 274.

Navy,¹ has been generally overlooked. It would be strange indeed were these the only instances during a period of fifty years when minutes of the kind were made. Now a search among the archives of the Public Record Office reveals that there is an abundance of such material, not only of earlier date than anyone has stated, but also of later times, which have not been utilized. In view of their bearing upon the history of the council, it seems useful to give an account of these newly found manuscripts. They are of various kinds, corresponding to the different proceedings of the council.

The earliest and simplest form of record made by the council was in connection with the petitions, of which thousands were received. It is well known how suitors addressed petitions to the king and council seeking remedies which they could not obtain from the ordinary courts. The responses were made regularly upon the backs of the same strips of parchment, in words as few as possible. As the council did not usually try cases, the endorsements consisted of brief directions to the suitors, the judges, or the chancellor: to the effect that the parties should sue at common law, or in the chancery, that writs should be issued, that judgment be rendered, and the like. The response assumed greater length when a point of law had to be explained. Not that all of the numberless responses were actually made by the council, for there were hearers and triers of petitions appointed to do much of the work. But it is plain that even too much of the council's time was spent in the hearing of private petitions.

The function of the council in the way of receiving and answering petitions has been adequately described by the ablest writers.² This much, however, it is necessary to recall as furnishing a clue to the council's proceedings in other matters, for the process of petition and response was followed in all kinds of business, public as well as private. It was in a manner analogous to that followed with the small private petitions, that the council was accustomed to deal with state questions submitted to it. The usual form in which matters for the consideration³ of the council were stated, consisted of a series of articles, each article being a distinct petition or proposition. A characteristic title upon one document of this kind reads, *fait a remembrer des choses a monstres au conseil nostre seigneur le Roi*.⁴ Such a document constituted a kind of agenda, which could

¹ Nicolas, *History of the Royal Navy*, II. 188-192.

² See Hale, *Jurisdiction of the House of Lords*; Maitland, *Memoranda of the Parliament of 1305*; and Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, II. 275.

³ Parliamentary Proceedings, Chancery, file VII, no. 19. The collection under this title in the Public Record Office is newly compiled, and contains much material, relating both to Parliament and to the council, which has not been available before.

be considered point by point. Upon the wide margins and between the paragraphs of such a parchment could be written the responses or decisions of the council to each point. In case the articles were accepted in their entirety the inscription was a simple matter.¹

It will illustrate a whole class of documents to describe one which belongs to the second year of Edward III.² In this John Darcy lays before the council a series of petitions in sixteen articles, stating the conditions upon which he is willing to go to Ireland as chief justice. He asks that certain men whom he names be placed in office as his associates; that the chief justice have powers of supervision over other officers; that he have the power to pardon for felony; that no grants in Ireland be made without consulting the justice and others of the council there; that it be granted by statute that all Irishmen wishing to use English laws be permitted to do so without having to buy charters for the privilege. The answers of the council are inserted between the lines and in the margins in a handwriting clearly different from the former. Most of the propositions were accepted with some modification. Some of the names suggested were scratched out and others substituted. As to the granting of pardons, it was answered that it seemed better that the power should not be exercised without consulting the king. As to the Irish freely enjoying English law, the justice was to get the opinion of the next Irish parliament. Other items were accepted with a simple *fiat*. The decisions thus reached were put into execution on the authority of "king and council," according to the attestations upon the letters of great seal that were forthwith issued.³

There is a document of the year 1311 which was one of a number coming from Gascony, perhaps having been drawn up in the king's council there, as others were.⁴ It consists of a series of articles, punctuated with the words, *item intimandum est*, *item consilium est*, etc., written in a provincial Latin strange to England. Most likely it was considered at the small council summoned at York for February 27, 1312, to confer on affairs of Aquitaine.⁵ The items in detail specify that the mayor and *jurati* of Bordeaux are increasing the taxes, that many officers commit excesses while the

¹ Upon one of the documents occurs the following marginal note in an unclerkly hand: *ceux articles sont lues devant le Roi et le conseil et sont acordez en touz points*. Parliamentary Proceedings, VII. 24.

² Parliamentary Proceedings, VI. 10.

³ *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 2 Edw. III., p. 316; *Calendar of Close Rolls*, p. 312.

⁴ *Diplomatic Documents*, Chancery, p. 114. This is another file into which many of the council documents have fallen.

⁵ *Parliamentary Writs*, II. 71.

country is distracted by war, that commissioners with plenary powers should be appointed, that the castles of Bordeaux need repair, that in the law-cases pending in the court of the king of France subjects of the king of England should be treated fairly, and that for use in these cases evidence should be diligently sought for in the king's treasury. The responses of the council are written in a small cramped hand between the several paragraphs. Many of the questions were referred to the seneschal of Gascony, who was to act with the advice of the king's council of that part. Some of the answers are made with the additional confirmation, "*placet regi*," while in some instances it was required, "*informetur rex*." As in other cases of the kind, the responses were the basis for executive orders, the appointment of a commission to Paris being upon the close roll of the same year in accordance with the Gascon petition.¹

That the procedure which has been illustrated in the foregoing examples was followed in much the same way by the king's council of Gascony, there is evidence in a large document of the year 1320.² It contains certain petitions from Agen and other towns asking for various franchises and for reforms in the Agenais. The articles from the towns having been first submitted to the seneschal and council of Gascony, received certain amendments at their hands, which are incorporated in the manuscript.³ In this form they were sent to England, where they were submitted to the council, the responses being inscribed in the usual manner. All the petitions were accepted but one, about which there was to be further deliberation.⁴

Considering the documents as respects their form, the result was different when at greater length responses to petitions were rendered upon separate parchments. Of the year 1334 there is a voluminous petition coming from the seneschal and council of Gascony to the king and council in England, consisting of twenty-nine articles relating to the aggressions of the king of France.⁵ A short inscription on one of the pages describes how the answers of the

¹ *Calendar of Close Rolls*, 6 Edw. II., p. 488.

² *Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls*, 5/16.

³ How the petitions were treated is told in the document itself. (*Articulos quos dominus Guillelmus de Monte Acuto quondam senescallus Vasconie una cum responsionibus dictorum articulorum et avisationibus per ipsum et vestrum consilium illarum partium inde factis vobis remisit, et quos post modum vos remisistis sub pede sigilli vestri senescallo Vasconie et mandastis observari nuper responses eis factas, etc.*)

⁴ *Postmodum exhibitis dictis articulis et diligenter examinatis visum est consilio quod poterunt confirmari salvo jure Regis excepto XX^{mo} de quo deliberaretur.*

⁵ *Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls*, 5/22.

council were returned in a roll. "*As touz les pointz q touchent les articles desuzditz est respondu en le point entre en un roule sur l'ordenance faite par le conseil sur les ditz articles et articles suauantz.*" In this case, as in most others when the same method was followed, petitions and responses have been irrecoverably separated.¹

Sometimes, in a way that was followed also with the private petitions, transcripts were made from the original membranes considered by the council. The distinguishing feature of the transcript is that both petitions and responses are in the same handwriting. While the original responses were often written in an irregular, unclerly hand, the copies were made by a professional scribe. In these cases the entire manuscript is made by the council or by its direction. A good example of a state paper of this kind is one, dated March 24, 1318, which embodies a report from the bishop of Worcester which was sent to the council for its consideration.² In a number of articles in the usual form it gives an account of certain judicial processes which were being drawn into the court of France, involving ministers and other subjects of the king of England in Aquitaine. Some of the recommendations of the bishop, who had been one of the king's proctors at the court of France regarding these cases, were that an effort should be made to have a joint commission appointed by the king of England and by the king of France to deal with the cases in dispute; that penalties imposed on the appellants should not be exacted provided they would withdraw their appeals; that in regard to certain cases request should be made for delay in the hope of a permanent peace.

Throughout the period under review the method described, of petition and response, was the most usual mode in council proceedings. In some ways it is the most satisfactory kind of record, for it reveals more clearly than any other the steps by which the council came to its decisions. Better than any other does it distinguish the council from Parliament, for the process is totally different from anything shown in the records of Parliament. The document of petitions when completed with the responses was considered to be fully binding as an expression of the will of the king and council.

¹ There is a noteworthy set of responses sent to Gascony about the year 1314, bearing the endorsement, *avisamenta consilii Regis super quibus petitur tangens Regi*. (Diplomatic Documents, Chancery, p. 398.) There is a series of recommendations as to problems of Ireland, which contains no responses. (Parliamentary Proceedings, VII. 19.)

² It describes itself as follows. *Dominus T. dei gratia Wigornensis episcopus liveravit Elie de Jonestone infrascriptos articulos portendos dicto domino Regi, cancellario, et thesaurario suis et ceteris de consilio ad quos pertinet super hiis consulere et remedia adhibere*. Diplomatic Documents, Chancery, 250.

This was expressed with regard to a series of petitions received in the sixteenth year of Edward III. from the prelates and barons of Ireland. "The king ordained that these should be diligently examined by the council and answer made, to be written after each petition, and then the king commanded that the answers with the articles should have full force with the penalties contained therein."¹ The petitions, with the answers and ordinances made thereupon, were then sent back to Ireland to be observed.²

The method of petition and response, however, was not the only method of council proceedings. A different, though not necessarily a more mature, form was observed when the things agreed to were recorded in the shape of minutes or resolutions, without reference to any petition or address. Such minutes containing recommendations, ordinances, or drafts of ordinances, were written always upon single and detached membranes, usually in a series of brief articles, as in the previous examples, with a preference for the less formal French language rather than the Latin, and are indicated by phrases like *fait a remembrer que, accorde just par le conseil, or avis est de conseil*. In some cases the appearance of the writing suggests that the articles were put down at different times, as the decisions were made, and sometimes space is left for more.

It is remarkable that some of the earliest records of the council should be of this kind. Thus there is an ordinance, apparently of the ninth year of Edward I.—*accorde est par le Roi e par sun conseil*—protecting from legal liabilities those who were going on service to Wales.³ Of the year 1209 there is a very clear record of an act, stated to be *ordinatum per Regem et consilium suum*, awarding sums of money to various Gascons who had lost their lands in the king's service. The document is remarkable in that it gives the names of the councillors, six in number, who were responsible for the measure.⁴ Of the same general form is an ordinance by the council, of the twenty-fourth year of Edward I., called "*de statu religiosorum de potestate regis Francie*," which relates to alien priories, forbidding them to exist within thirteen miles of the sea or other navigable waters.⁵

In the first and second years of Edward II. there are some notable ordinances relating to the government of Scotland, directing appointments to offices, salaries, military equipment, and like matters.⁶ A

¹ *Calendar of Close Rolls*, 16 Edw. III., 508.

² *Ibid.*, 516.

³ *Parliamentary Proceedings*, I. 21-30.

⁴ *Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls*, 5/5.

⁵ *Parliamentary Proceedings*, II. 22.

⁶ *Diplomatic Documents*, Chancery, 217 and 809.

great many of the proceedings relate to Ireland. Of the sixteenth year of Edward III. there is the draft of an ordinance concerning the government of Ireland, which claims to be merely the "advice" of the council.¹ The extended and completed ordinance may be found upon a printed roll of the same year.² A larger number could be produced relating to Gascony.

Of small instruments which are merely the drafts of single orders made by the council or with its sanction, to be issued as letters under the great seal, there exists an indefinite number.³ If it be thought that the memoranda here described may have been written by some councillor for his personal use rather than by the council's own direction, there is sufficient proof to the contrary in occasional statements upon the membranes, such as *le conseil ad cy escrit son avis* and *cestes notes furent faites par le conseil*.

The manner of record thus described, of ordinances and resolutions, is less distinctively of the council than the former one of petitions and responses. The same general form was followed in the ordinances of great councils and parliaments. From the words *ordinatum est per consilium* alone one cannot tell which council is meant. It is clear and satisfactory only when the names of the councillors who drafted or assented to the acts are given. In the fourteenth century this was not commonly done. Under Edward I., strange to say, the names were stated more frequently than in the next reigns. In the later years of Edward III. the practice began of appending the names to the memoranda which passed the council. This became the regular way by which acts of the council were authenticated. In no case, however, during the reigns of Richard II. or Henry IV. were the names written as signatures; they were inscribed in the same hand as the rest of the manuscript, without doubt by the clerk.⁴ In 1422 it was enacted that the clerk of the council should write the names.⁵ It was about this time that signatures appear. In 1424 it was enacted that "the names of thasenteurs be written of their own hand."⁶ The ordinances of 1426 were said to have been subscribed by the lords of the council with their own hands.⁷ The earliest instance that the writer has hap-

¹ Parliamentary Proceedings, VII. 13.

² Calendar of Close Rolls, 16 Edw. III., 508.

³ A schedule of council orders, on matters relating to the war with France and Scotland, may be found in Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, 1/20.

⁴ It is necessary to explain this point in detail, for a quite wrong impression has been given by Nicolas, *Proceedings of the Privy Council*, II. xxvi.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III. 18.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 150, 216.

⁷ *Per dominos de consilio suis propriis manibus se subscriptentex. ibid.*, III. 221.

pened to find of autograph signatures by the members of the council occurs in the second year of Henry VI.¹ As most of the council records of that time now remaining are transcriptions, it is impossible to say how generally this practice was followed.²

Taking now into consideration the council memoranda of whatever kind, whether responses or resolutions, it is a further step to inquire for what purpose they were made and how they were used. Now and again one finds a suggestion upon a bill to the following effect: *ceste bille fut liere de par le Roi et le conseil et sur ceo fut bref fait.*³ To be carried into effect it was necessary for the orders of the council to be embodied in letters or writs either of the great seal or of the privy seal.

Letters of privy seal were the most direct means of expressing the will of the king or of the council, the keeper being one of the most constant attendants. Some of these bear the stamp of the council's sanction by the conventional attestation, *per consilium*. Many of them, however, bear evidence of being written in the council or by its direction. There exist a number of writs of privy seal that are warrants directed from the council to the chancellor for the issue of letters of the great seal. Council warrants are on file beginning with the fifteenth year of Edward III.,⁴ although here and there are earlier ones to the same effect. As these writs invariably bear the date and place of the council's action, and are more likely than other notes to give the names, they have a special value as records.

Letters of the great seal, including letters close and patent, were used for the more formal administrative orders. Sometimes upon a council paper one finds a statement like the following: *Cestes notes deinz escrites furent faites par le conseil le Roi et mandees a la chauncellerie pour engrosser.*⁵ From notes of the council, whether an endorsement of a petition, a writ of privy seal, a memorandum, or other communication, the chancery issued the letters desired. This is the meaning of the recurring phrases of attestation to be found throughout the calendars of close rolls and patent rolls, *by council*, *by petition of council*, and the like. A comparison of letters of the great seal, such as are given in the printed rolls, with writs of privy seal and other council minutes, shows that with the neces-

¹ British Museum, Cotton MSS., Vespasian, C. XIV. 246.

² Other examples of signed council memoranda of the fourth year of Henry VI. are: Public Record Office Museum, Pedestal 15; Cotton MSS., Cleopatra, IV. 26, 27, 28, 30, 32.

³ Warrants Privy Seal, 19 Edw. III., file 1538.

⁴ Warrants Privy Seal, files 1538-1548.

⁵ Parliamentary Proceedings, VII. 13.

sary change of form, with the addition of explanatory phrases, and with the greater redundancy of official Latin, the chancery faithfully reproduced the data of the original draft. That the clerks of the chancery were expected to fill in the minor details is many times stated upon the original memoranda, which say, "as is more fully contained in letters patent." Particularly as to the dating, it is important to observe, the letter close or patent gives not the date and place of its own issue, but those borne upon the letter of privy seal or other previous draft. Thus the letters of the great seal are an indirect or secondary record of the council proceedings, but are not on this account the less useful.

Upon one of the council ordinances is an inscription that it was delivered to the keeper of the rolls of the chancery to be enrolled.¹ Certain it is that a large number of council ordinances are to be found upon the various chancery rolls, including the close rolls and the patent rolls, the Gascon rolls, the parliament rolls, and others. The same is true of enrollments in the exchequer. Upon one of the memoranda rolls it is told how the treasurer, delivering an ordinance of the council, directed it there to be enrolled.² Here and there throughout the rolls of Edward I. are to be found small membranes, which are original memoranda of the council. Upon one of them is the statement: *ista cedula liberata fuit per cancellarium in pleno consilio apud Evesham in cancellaria irrotulanda.*³ Instead of being transcribed they were merely attached to the roll. That the council could thus command the rolls of the chancery and of the exchequer is a reason why it did not have a roll of its own.

The records of the action of the council, then, appear in as many as four stages:

1. The original memoranda of the council, the chief purpose of which, as appears in this connection, was not to form a record, but to serve as drafts for the ensuing letters and enrollments, and for the practical use of the officers and clerks who had to follow them. For this reason they were made often in duplicate, and in one case at least there were as many as ten copies issued:⁴

¹ *Et memorandum quod tertio die Augusti anno regni Ricardi secundi secundo ista cedula liberata fuit per consilium . . . custodi rotularum cancellarie predictae irrotulanda.* Parliamentary Proceedings, IX. 8.

² In the Memoranda Roll K. R. of the Exchequer, 3 Edw. II., Trinity term, is the following entry: *Memorandum quod Johan de Sandale thesaurarius liberavit hic septimo die Augusti hoc anno quandam ordinationem factam per Regem et consilium suum super compto garderobe . . . et eam precepit irrotulari in hec verba, etc.*

³ Close Roll, 29 Edw. III., m. 14.

⁴ Parliamentary Proceedings, I. 21-30.

2. The writs of privy seal, some of which might be classed with the former;

3. Letters close and patent, which are the most available of all sources, calendars of them having now been in large part printed;

4. Lastly, when a final engrossment was desired, the enrollments upon one or more of the rolls in the custody of the chancery or the exchequer. It is important to show this connection, for the original minutes are mostly lost, having served their purpose for the time being; while upon the rolls may still be found most, if not all, that is important of the acts of the council.

In this light we can understand the request of the commons in the twenty-seventh year of Edward III., when they asked that certain articles of the ordinance of the staple should be rehearsed at the next Parliament, "inasmuch as the ordinances and agreements made in councils were not of *record*, as if they had been made in Parliament." The king answered that they should be rehearsed in Parliament and put upon the roll.¹

Other documents there are, some written by the council, others pertaining to the council, which are not so directly converted into administrative orders. Those which reveal the relations of king and council are interesting as giving a certain individuality to that body. There is preserved a large amount of official correspondence that went on between the king and council, at times with daily frequency. Letters from the king to the council appear as early as Henry III., while letters from the council to the king are seen in the reign of Edward II.² Messages of the king ask for the immediate consideration of a petition or some other memorandum which he sends; letters of the council report what has been done and ask for special mandates or information when they are in doubt.

As a kind of *agenda* for the consideration of the council, in the sixteenth year of Edward II. the king sent a series of articles, the first of which proposed the drafting of a statute for the repeal of the ordinances of 1311.³ In conclusion it reads, "and be it known that the king wishes that each sage of his council consider these points, that they may amend the law for the profit of the king and the people; that they submit their agreement in the form of a statute or make some other remedy if it will suffice, and that such thing should be put into form in order that he may be advised before the Parliament the more readily to deliver to the people who come to Parliament." A clearer statement of the function of the council in devising the legislation of Parliament could hardly be made.

¹ *Report on the Dignity of a Peer*, VI. 323.

² *Ancient Correspondence* in 58 volumes.

³ *Parliamentary Proceedings*, V. 10.

In many of the council notes it is evident that the council is acting apart from the king. Sometimes upon petitions there are double inscriptions, the first being the opinion of the council stated conditionally, *s'il plect au Roy*; the second bearing the approval of the king, *il plect au Roy*. Receiving a series of petitions from Ireland the council answered most of the items, but in one case the response was, *soit parle au Roi de ce point*.¹ A set of council ordinances made in the conditional form—*il semble au conseil s'il plect au Roi*—contains answers of the king in side notes.²

One of the most interesting of all the council papers is one of the year 1339, which is a transcription of certain messages that have passed between England and Flanders. It is entitled, "Articles reported to the chancellor, treasurer, and others of the king's council in England . . . from the king across the sea and the responses to the same articles."³ The document is plainly one made in the council, and not, as certain others were, a parchment sent from outside receiving the marginal notes of the council. The messages from the king, who was at war, express his disappointment that he has not received enough of the revenues and supplies, while the answers give the explanations of the council that they have done their duty. In this way some information may be gathered about the state of the taxes of that year, especially as to that very remarkable subsidy of 1338 when the king was granted the pre-emption of 20,000 sacks of wool at a fixed price. The management of this levy, it may be said by the way, had devolved entirely upon the council, and was turning out to be far from successful. Regarding the 20,000 sacks of wool, the king in his message complained that of the assignments already made not one half had come to him; the council answered that as to this and other things they were sending messengers to explain, and asked the king to consider some facts contained in a certain schedule to be sent. The king said further that he would like an explanation how certain parties to whom assignments of wool had been made had not only failed to receive them, but had found their assignments to be repealed and changed. The council replied that some of the assignments in question they had delivered and that none had been repealed or changed without the king's command. Most of all did the king complain of the corrupt and faulty methods of the levy, by which inferior wool of light weight and not marketable had been sent him; the council

¹ Parliamentary Proceedings, VIII. 27. Similar forms are in Diplomatic Documents, Chancery, p. 114.

² Chancery Miscellaneous Rolls, 1/20.

³ Parliamentary Proceedings, VII. 7.

claimed to have done their duty by providing in their commissions and writs against these very evils. Certain petty financial devices suggested by the king, such as the repeal of some assignments and the recall of ministers' fees, were pointed out by the council to be quite impracticable. Altogether the relations here revealed amount almost to an altercation.

As an example of a message sent by the council to the king, there is one of the seventeenth year of Edward III., bearing the following inscription: *Ces sont les articles baille a William de Edington pur monstrier a nostre Seigneur le Roi de par son conseil.*¹ Conversely to the document just mentioned, it contains certain propositions of the council with the answers to each given by the king.

The council being a body which carried on negotiations, whether with private parties like merchants, or with foreign princes, there are not a few records of proceedings of this kind. Of the agreements which were reached by the council on the one hand and the ambassadors or merchants on the other, the most suitable form was the device of the duplicate parchment known as the indenture. Instances of original indentures are to be found from the time of Edward I. How in the twelfth year of Edward II. ambassadors of the count of Flanders came to a parliament at York and treated with the council there as to certain damages sustained by the people of Flanders as well as by the people of England by certain depredations at sea, is described in an indented parchment as follows: *fait a remembrer qe come avant ces heures trete fut entre le conseil le Roi Dengleterre et certains messengers le Conte de Flandres . . . les quex messages vindrent au dit Roi a son parlement a Everewik . . . et reherse entre le conseil le dit Roi et les ditz messages, etc.*²

As an instance of the very many contracts or agreements that were made between the king or his council and the merchant companies, there is the original note of an assignment of wool to the Bardi and Perucchi in the twelfth year of Edward III.³ The document itself explains how the agreement, which was made with the advice of the council, having been amended in certain points by the king's secretary, was delivered to the chancery, where it was engrossed in the same form. As in the case of other minutes, most

¹ Parliamentary Proceedings, VII. 15.

² Diplomatic Documents, Chancery, p. 143.

³ Parliamentary Proceedings, VII. 8. The following words occur in an endorsement, such as was frequently used to describe the purport of a document: *Fait a remembrer que ceste note entre Seigneur le Roi et les marchands de Bardi et Perucchi just fait par lavisement du conseil et puis amenda en ascunz pointz par Mons. Geoffrey Lecrop et livre en chauncellerie pour engrosser et est engrossé sur mesme la forme.*

of the original indentures are lost, but a very large number may be found inscribed after the same manner upon the rolls of the chancery.

Of documents which were not made by the council, but which relate to it and are useful as affording sidelights, brief mention may be made of certain exchequer accounts of expenditures. Among the fragments of exchequer memoranda, for the most part ill preserved and hardly legible, are the accounts of the fees and wages of councillors.¹ In cases where it was a matter of daily wages, at the rate of 10s. or 20s. a day, detailed statements are given of the very days and places in which these men served or attended the council. The earliest of such accounts is that of Master Andrew de Offord, of the twentieth year of Edward III.² Another series of special accounts relates to the *jantacula* or breakfasts, which were served to the council at times in order that its sittings might be prolonged.³ These accounts give a list of all the provisions purchased, including ale, wine, bread, meat, fish, game, vegetables, spices and sweets, with the prices of each. The cost of such entertainment, while varying from twenty to one hundred shillings a day, was on the average about sixty shillings a day.⁴

Returning to the council records, there remains a word to be said as to how they were kept and how they are now to be found. As yet in the fourteenth century the council was deficient in that it did not keep a regular roll of its proceedings, as did Parliament and each of the common-law courts. Unless its acts appeared upon such a register, they were not in a technical sense considered matters of record at all. What then became of the bills, memoranda, indentures, letters, and other loose parchments which were used by the council? As is well known, there were two main repositories of government muniments, the exchequer and the chancery. Council membranes are to be found in each. In general one may say that those which passed through the office of the privy seal were handed over to the exchequer for safe keeping, while those which were used for orders of the great seal were given to the chancery. As the original files in these departments have been quite broken up it is not possible to say much about them. One reads, for instance, how bundles of letters and other instruments were delivered by the council to the exchequer, where they were put in a

¹ Exchequer, K. R., bundle 96, Nos. 1-7.

² *Ibid.*, 96/2.

³ *Ibid.*, 96/8-13.

⁴ Of the information contained in these accounts I have made further use in an article to be printed in the *English Historical Review* for January, 1906.

chest with a special mark for identification.¹ It is possible that in the case of many of the memoranda, which were only for temporary use, no effort was made for preservation. At any rate, the loose parchments were easily scattered, stolen and lost. Some of them fell ultimately into the hands of private collectors. The few and only proceedings now in print for the reign of Richard II. were taken from a collection of this kind, namely, the Cottonian Library.² There are, however, council proceedings for this reign and afterward which are not embraced in that publication. That council records have seemed to begin with the tenth year of Richard II. is therefore a mere accident of collection.

Those which remain in the government's custody are to be found among a half-dozen or more files of the Public Record Office, where they are listed not as council records, but according to their subject-matter. The modern rearrangements and classifications have tended the more to scatter the documents. Taken out of their setting, with responses apart from petitions, and even with one half parted from the other, one does not always have the means of identifying these stray parchments. If internal evidence be lacking it can be done only by dint of search for a companion document, such as may most likely be found with the aid of an index of petitions or letters of the great seal.

Not until 1421 was the register known as the Book of the Council begun, which was compiled by copying the minutes upon a regular roll.³ The original method, however, of making notes upon loose membranes still continued, and many of these are extant. From them it is plain that the Book was not intended to contain all of the proceedings. A comparison of a few of the memoranda of the reign of Henry VI. with the corresponding entries in the Book of the Council makes it clear that the transcription might be only an abstract of the real minutes. Only fragments of the Book are extant, but it is evident that it was a very imperfectly kept register. There is very good reason to believe that there are other records of the council still undiscovered, which may be hidden in one library or another.⁴

¹ *Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Exchequer*, 38-41 Edw. III., passim.

² These archives therefore happen to be in the British Museum, instead of in the Public Record Office, where they would properly belong.

³ Described in Nicolas, *Proceedings of the Privy Council*, Vol. II., pp. xxvi et seq.

⁴ There are the two memoranda of the years 1339 and 1341 translated in Nicolas, *History of the Royal Navy*, Vol. II., pp. 188-192. That the author does not state where the original manuscripts are to be found has puzzled others, as well as myself. My search for these, however, has been rewarded by finding many others of the same kind.

Finally what is shown by these records concerning the development of the council itself? Enough has been said within the limits of this paper to show that certain current views regarding this body must be modified. So far as the records of council proceedings show, there was no considerable organic change during the reign of Richard II. Comparing the memoranda of that time with those of the earlier period there is no particular difference to be observed, beyond the growth of an institution already mature. Of new historical material the minutes of the council will probably not furnish much, for the same data may generally be found elsewhere. What is of more value than the miscellaneous subject-matter which they contain, is the clearer understanding that the original records give of the steps of council procedure. They are perhaps most serviceable in showing how the acts of the council came to find place upon the various rolls of the chancery and the exchequer. They reveal also, what is partly understood already, a power working with great persistency in legislation and administration,¹ which it would be no exaggeration to call the mainspring of the government. They show, moreover, that the usual working council, the *consilium ordinarium*, as some have called it, consisted of a very small number of men. No wonder it roused the jealousy of Parliament and particularly of the House of Lords, which sought in various ways to curb its powers!

JAMES F. BALDWIN.

¹ The functions of the council in judicial proceedings, about which more is generally known, I have held for the present in reserve.

THE LITERARY ACTIVITY OF THE EMPEROR MAXIMILIAN I.

It is not so rare as one might suppose for great rulers to try their hands at literature, and Julius Caesar and Marcus Aurelius wrote books which rank them among the masters. If Maximilian I., Emperor of Germany from 1494-1517, failed to write anything comparable to the *Commentaries* on the Gallic War, it was not for lack of trying. During all the latter part of his life he was busied with plans for writing or collating. The list of proposed subjects finally grew to over a hundred and ranged from a treatise on cooking to a collection of prayers. But it is very doubtful whether he ever took much interest in any subject simply to produce a beautiful, an interesting or a useful book. He did not write from the love of letters.

Maximilian was firmly convinced that he could do almost everything better than anybody alive, better than all but a few of those who were dead. And a severe analysis of his books shows in them all the same leading motive—bragging. He brags of what has come to him by birth and what he has achieved; of what he owns and what he has done; of what he is and what his children will become. He brags of his great skill in cooking and of his piety; of his dancing and his generalship; of his knowledge of horses and pictures; of the marriages of his children and of the waters he preserves for fishing; of his ability to talk many languages and hunt all kinds of game; of the antiquity of his family and of his skill in blacksmithing; of his kindness to the poor and of his slaughter of enemies; of his mercy and of his executions of rebel peasants; of his ability to endure fatigue and his regularity in saying his prayers. Every book in which he took any interest is either a record of his deeds, a catalogue of his possessions or an exhortation to his descendants to base their greatness on his example. His prayer-book seems an exception. But its latest commentator believes it was designed to promote a pious enterprise of which Maximilian, as head of Christendom, was to be the glorious leader.

The works on genealogy and history are not even apparent exceptions to this inspiration of vanity. Maximilian's plan for his own tomb symbolizes his view of genealogy and history. As he saw it in his mind's eye, forty life-sized figures surrounded it.

They represented Maximilian's ancestors. A hundred small statues of saints of the house of Hapsburg kept their respectful watch over a sarcophagus adorned with twenty-four reliefs of the supreme achievements of Maximilian's life. Over it all, dominating history, genealogy, his own achievements, towered a colossal statue of Maximilian himself.

It is difficult to find a finer example of the desire for the extension of the *ego*, than is shown by Maximilian's work in literature and patronage of art. This egotism is not indeed too crassly expressed. Maximilian knew that it was not wise to put the trumpet of his praise too openly to his own lips. Neither is it concealed with art, as that clever man of the world, Julius Caesar, buried his commendation of his own generalship beneath an impersonal manner. At times it is naïve and childlike. At times the reader notes it indirectly, as one sees the polite struggle of a very vain man to take active interest in talking about anything except his own successes. But open or veiled, it is omnipresent as sunlight on an April day. And the man who survives the reading of all Maximilian's books in succession, receives at least one clear and distinct impression—of continuous, all-pervading vanity.

Vanity, unlike pride, is a weakness rather than a vice. It is not incompatible with amiability, and Maximilian was a most amiable man. It often accompanies capacity, and perhaps literary capacity more often than any other form of capacity; witness for instance the stolid vanity of Wordsworth, the touchy vanity of Pope. But Maximilian had no literary capacity, only a tireless energy in planning, correcting, inspiring the work of secretaries, scholars and illustrators. This judgment is, of course, a matter of taste. The reader who recalls the vague praises of Maximilian's literary ability and artistic knowledge which abound in German popular histories will question it. But if he reads Maximilian's books through, the question will be given up. Even without that severe cure, it is sufficient to notice that the praises are all vague and for his literary activity as a whole. None of the men who in modern times have made special studies of his separate works has anything to say in praise either of the form or the content of the particular object of his study.¹

Nevertheless, though these books are dull in themselves, they have an overtone of interest. The writer of the only essay in English about any of them had apparently not seen the latest

¹ For *Teuerdank*, see judgments of Haltans, *Einleitung*, pp. 106, 108, 109; of Goedeke, *Einleitung*, xii, xxi, xxii; of Laschitzer. For *Weiss König* see Alwin Schultz, *Jahrbücher der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen*, etc., Vol. VI.

edition of the books he wrote about and the conclusions of the only men who have thoroughly studied manuscripts of them, but the title of his essay is very suggestive, "Tewrdanck and Weiss Kunig and their Historical Interest."¹

The literary work of Maximilian throws light upon a strange personality who played a prominent part upon the stage of history. It does not show Maximilian as the man he thought he was, but it is none the less illuminating for that.

His preparation for literary work was not a very good one. He wrote in his autobiography, of his own childhood, "Although the King was very young he grew so in good habits that he surpassed all other princes and noblemen's children so that everybody wondered at his youth, and the old White King (his father) rejoiced at it, as may well be imagined." But, unfortunately, this summary of an old man writing an account of his life for an example to his grandchildren, does not agree with the indignation he expressed in his manhood against the tutor who had allowed him to grow up in ignorance. Neither does it agree with his father's recollection of the boy's education. For when Maximilian at the age of twenty-seven was crowned King of the Romans at Frankfort, his father expressed the greatest astonishment at the fact that he could make a speech to the magnates in Latin, "For certainly," he said, "at the age of twelve years I was afraid he would turn out either mute or a fool."

When he came to the Netherlands at eighteen as husband of the Duchess, the French statesman, Commynes, thought him very badly educated. He did not remain so. Maximilian had a vast fund of nervous energy always seeking outlets. He never wasted time, and even his amusements were strenuous. He laid aside campaigning or left the labors of the council-chamber only for a hard hunting-trip or a whirl of banquets, masks and balls. When he once discovered the pleasures of the mind and tastes he flung himself into them with the same restless ardor he showed on all sides of life. He surrounded himself with scholars, employed artists, and gave himself the best education he could pick up in the intervals of life by reading, study and conversation. This love of learning, letters and art became, like everything else in him, tributary to his dominant passion, a ceaseless greed for distinction. But it grew from a nobler root. It arose out of a sense of pleasure in the exercise of the mind; just as his lifelong passion for hunting grew out of the

¹ A. W. Ward, in *An English Miscellany presented to Dr. Furnivall*, Oxford, 1901.

habit of finding pleasure in the exercise of skill and strength in following the chamois to the cliffs or the wild boar to the swamps.

It was natural for an active-minded man who ruled many territories to gain some knowledge of a number of languages. His autobiography says that he could dictate to secretaries in several languages at the same time, and talk to the captains of his army in seven. One of his biographers says that he could speak Italian, French and Latin elegantly. We cannot test this account of his Italian, but it is to be hoped that he spoke French better than he wrote it in those letters to his daughter Margaret which have been preserved. We know this was not the case with his Latin, for a distinguished preacher of his day has left an account of a visit to Maximilian in which he says, "*Latinus bonus sed scripto melius quam verbo*". In that case his spoken Latin must have been very poor.

Every patron who dabbles in art, scholarship or letters becomes a shining mark for flattery. But the praise of Maecenas is not all conscious flattery. The modern critic often finds it hard to maintain a just severity toward the verses, the picture or the statue turned out in the spare hours of the talented amateur who happens to be a charming woman of high social position. The amiable manners of the man who held the highest secular title in the society of Europe of the early sixteenth century produced the same effect. A curious chance has preserved to us from Maximilian's life a classical example of this familiar hypnotic influence of social position in paralyzing critical perceptions.

Willibald Pirckheimer, a cultivated patrician of Nuremberg, served as commander of his city's contingent in the Swiss war. In the year 1499 he crossed the lake of Constance with Maximilian, and years afterward described to Melancthon the voyage. Maximilian spent part of it dictating in Latin some paragraphs of his autobiography. In the evening he gave Pirckheimer the day's dictation and asked him his opinion of the "soldier's Latin". Pirckheimer assured Melancthon that no German historian had ever written in so pure a style as these dictations, for which since the Emperor's death he had vainly searched. Recently some fragments of this autobiography have been found, and on one of the sheets the scribe has written, "King Maximilian wrote this while we were sailing to Lindau on the Lake of Constance". It is therefore the very passage on which Pirckheimer afterwards based his judgment to Melancthon that no German historian had written purer Latin. The editor of the manuscript diplomatically "leaves it to the reader to decide whether the Latinity of the Emperor, the style of his dic-

tation, really deserves the praise of Pirkheimer". Other writers are less reserved. "A more miserable kitchen Latin could scarcely be imagined". Certainly every part of Pirkheimer's own book *De Bello Helvetico* would pass muster as a school-exercise in elementary Latin style with far less criticism than these paragraphs which he told Melancthon were unsurpassed by any German historian. His own language Maximilian never learned to write with great clearness or any freedom.

Maximilian's book-making activity may be most easily described in short space under three heads:

I. Books for which the reader has the right to hold him personally responsible.

II. Books whose manuscripts he criticized and supervised.

III. The expression of his ideas in illustrations and sets of wood-cuts.

Maximilian seems to have written only one book without any help, the *Geheimes Jagdbuch*.¹ The manuscript, which contains only twenty-five hundred words, is entirely in his own hand. The Emperor wrote it to teach his two grandchildren, Carl and Ferdinand, the art of hunting. The glamor of an amiable personality in a high position, which affected those who knew Maximilian, is not yet exhausted. The editor speaks of "the fresh air of the woods that breathes from its lines—the reflective sense for nature that takes us captive". But as a matter of fact, it would be difficult to write twenty-five hundred words, chiefly about chamois-hunting in Tyrol, drier and less captivating. Nearly a quarter of the *Jagdbuch* is occupied by a list of hunting preserves and houses. Four-fifths of the rest is filled with minute directions about dress, food and conduct while hunting. Of these miscellaneous directions some are useless, some the boys would have learned by common sense, most of the remainder any of the huntsmen would have shown them in one trip. They are told nothing of value about the habits of the game. There is an absence of any sense of the beauty of nature. This is the more remarkable, for, in an age when mountain-climbing was not fashionable, Maximilian tells us that he had been on the top of the highest mountain in Europe,—he meant either the Gross Glockner or the Gross Venediger. Maximilian may have been like those modern Alpinists who think of their record and never of the view. More probably he lacked, not the feeling for natural beauty shown in the French hunting treatises of his contemporaries, but the power to express it.

¹ Beautifully printed by Thomas von Karajan, 1859, second edition, together with a modern German translation.

The disappointed reader rouses when the writer announces that he will close his book with some wonderful true hunting stories. But they are not very interesting. "The Great Huntsman killed a hundred ducks with a hundred and four shots". He saw a "chamois taken in a fish net; a stag in a house; a wild boar in a mill-wheel". He mixes with such sentences riddles of this sort: "The Great Huntsman arrived on the top of the greatest mountain of Europe without touching the globe or the mountain". The answer probably is, he walked over the snow. All the recorded specimens of Maximilian's wit are of this exceedingly simple and almost childish type.

Three things in this dull performance are interesting. First, his naïve self-glorification. He speaks of himself as the Great Huntsman. And once when he had written Kaiser Maximilian he struck it out and wrote the Great Huntsman. His dreams for the greatness of his house show in the phrase by which he calls the future head of the Hapsburgs, "Thou King of Austria". The title was then "Duke of Austria". One single paragraph shows a touch of that sympathetic tact in personal intercourse which was Maximilian's rarest quality. It suggests the best reason why a gentleman should cherish the survival of primitive instinct in the love of hunting and fishing—to keep him in touch with simple men and the fundamental needs of life. "Thou King of Austria shalt always rejoice in the great pleasures of woodcraft for thy health and refreshing and the comfort of thy subjects . . . because they have access to you, and while hunting you can help the petitions of the poor, for the common man will come closer to you . . . in the hunting field than in houses".

Before the year 1888 the list of extant books of the first class was supposed to begin and end with the title of this little treatise. The two great autobiographical works, *Teuerdank* and *Weiss Künig*, were thought to be the work of the imperial secretaries, carrying out general suggestions of Maximilian. A more careful study of the manuscript has dispelled this false impression. As a result of his examination of the four different codices containing drafts of *Teuerdank*, Mr. Simon Laschitzer concludes, "The Emperor himself was the chief redactor of the poem. He himself gave the contents of each separate chapter; and not only those in which his different adventures are told, but also those which simply adorn the poem with mystic or didactic passages. . . . It is certain that without his consent no verse of the poem and no illustration was sent to the printer. And finally he settled the order of the separate chapters".

Teuerdank was printed in 1517, and was the only one of Maximilian's works to reach the public during his life. It was begun more than twelve years before, and at least three men helped to put Maximilian's ideas into halting verses, which he criticized, changed and combined. In 1517 the Germans had not yet achieved a national language. Even men of position used dialects in their letters. *Teuerdank* is written in the court language in which Martin Luther found the starting-point for the national language he formed for his translation of the Bible. Hence, one of the editors of *Teuerdank* has written that there is "no work of the age before Luther so easy for a modern German to read". It is doubtful whether anybody finds it easy to read this labored allegorical poem describing the mythical adventures of Teuerdank (Maximilian) on his journey to marry his first wife, Mary of Burgundy. Three treacherous characters, Badluck, Rashness and Envy, plot to destroy him. In succession they meet Maximilian and tempt him into a variety of dangerous positions from which by courage, wisdom and skill he escapes. From a moral point of view this is admirable enough, but the allegory halts. Its standing difficulty is the incredible obtuseness of the hero. It took Teuerdank fifty unfortunate adventures to find out that Badluck was a treacherous counsellor. Surely for a cool and clever hero that was a little slow. At the end Teuerdank reaches his bride and the three scoundrels are put to death.

The carrying out of this plan is monotonous. Envy plunges Teuerdank into two kinds of dangers: of war and of the tilt-yard. There are thirty of these. Badluck and Rashness lead him into dangers of travel, of hunting, and the handling of weapons, varied by two illnesses. There are sixty-three of these, and we are told with unvarying monotony the most various adventures: how the hero did not break through the ice—how powder did not explode when he was duck-shooting in a boat full of it—how water saved his life on a number of occasions because he did not get drowned in it—how he went into a cage of lions—how stones did not fall on him—how the doctors did not kill him because he prescribed for himself—how an avalanche missed him—how he killed a number of animals and how a number of men failed to kill him. The probability is that most of these things really happened or failed to happen. In talking of some of them he must have been interesting. But the poem uses just as many and just as dull sentences in telling how Teuerdank did not step on a rotten beam in an old tower, as in describing his single-handed killing of a boar at bay in a tangled swamp. All the adventures sound very much alike. The most successful literary effort of the poem is the search for laudatory

epithets to link with the name of the hero; the net result is fifteen.

But in its day the book was popular. It was twice printed during the life of the author, each time in two editions. Eighteen years later it was again issued and before the sixteenth century closed it was modernized, appearing in four editions. A hundred years later, in 1670, it was again modernized and printed in two editions. This popularity was doubtless due partly to the affectionate interest which gathered around the legendary figure of Maximilian as a typical Kaiser of the German folk, and partly to the splendid wood-cuts his care provided for the book.

The second of Maximilian's greater literary works is the *Weiss Kunig*, first printed more than a hundred and fifty years after his death. It was long regarded as to a great extent the production of a certain Marx Treizsaurwein, one of his secretaries. Mr. Alwin Schultz, the editor of the final edition of it, says: "What we have of the *Weiss Kunig* is, with the possible exception of the first and second part, unquestionably the personal work of Maximilian himself. Nevertheless, Maximilian permitted his private secretary to dedicate the manuscript to the King of Spain and to his two grandchildren and so to appear, in a way, as the author; just as Melchior Pfinzing had done with *Teuerdank*."

Weiss Kunig is an unfinished autobiography in three parts. The last and longest part relates to the achievements of the hero in diplomacy and war. Treizsaurwein tells in a final note that he ordered the dictations of the Emperor, and the internal evidence supports the assertion. The names of the chief personages are concealed. For example, the Fish King means the Doge of Venice; the Blue King, the King of France; the King with Three Crowns, the Pope; the Old White King, Maximilian's father; the Young White King, Maximilian himself. But beyond this disguise the book purports to be history and not allegory. It is really historical romance. The object of the writer was, as Treizsaurwein explains in the dedication, to present to his grandsons, that they might follow in his footsteps, the example of a king ruling in the fear of God. The last editor, writing under the shadow of the throne of Maximilian's descendant, diplomatically remarks: "How far in his relations the imperial poet presents the facts in a light favorable to himself, historians will perhaps measure". It does not need a very careful measure. The *Weiss Kunig* is as bad history as it is literature. In a style clumsy and monotonous, it shows us Maximilian not as he was but as he wanted to appear to posterity. That this treatment of history to his own advantage was more naive self-consciousness than intentional distortion, is quite possible. His

attitude in the case of his *Genealogy* suggests this explanation of the suppressions and distortions of the *Weiss Kunig*.

The *Genealogy* was only a part of a cyclis of works he ordered written to display the history of his family. A number of men were engaged in making studies for it, and the Emperor gave a roving commission to search all the convent libraries for material. The researches finally took shape in a great work in five books by Dr. Jacob Mennel, entitled *Die fürstliche Chronik Kaiser Maximilian's genannt Geburtspiegel*.

It opened with a chronicle showing how the Franks were descended through the Romans from Hector of Troy, which prepared the way for showing Maximilian's descent from Priam. It contained also the legends of one hundred and seventy canonized saints, all of whom are in some way connected with the genealogical tables of Maximilian's family, which, with descriptions of their coats-of-arms, complete the volume. But the Emperor, either from his own studies or the suggestions of rival scholars, demanded proofs of the correctness of this genealogical tree. Especially he asked proof of the descent of his ancestor Clovis from Hector of Troy. Mennel referred the Emperor to information he had received from a certain abbot, Trithemius of Sponheim. Trithemius informed the Emperor that a certain Hunibald had written in the time of Clovis an account of the origin of the Franks and their migration from Troy to Germany. He had made extracts from that work, but the manuscript itself he had left in Sponheim eight years ago. His successor as abbot had sold a lot of works to the abbot of Hirschau. The libraries of the two monasteries were carefully searched, but no chronicle of Hunibald could be found. Then Trithemius printed a work on the origin of the Franks from his own pen, with a number of extracts from the lost Hunibald, and Dr. Mennel based on it a new line of descent for Maximilian. A certain learned Dr. Stabius was then asked by the Emperor to decide which was the better genealogy. His report concluded that neither was reliable. It pointed out that the first filled an interval of two hundred and nine years between two historical persons by one name, Amprintas, and suggested that Amprintas must have been rather old when he died. It showed that the second rested on the word of Trithemius about a vanished manuscript. Trithemius had made too many mistakes where his statements could be corrected by authority to entitle him to credit where they could not. Stabius finished by making very pointed remarks about Trithemius's character. He even took the pains to provide his manuscript with a caricature of the abbot as a three-headed monster in a monk's gown. He followed this attack

by another writing saying that there never had been a Hunibald except in Trithemius's imagination. This seems to have been true. When, after Trithemius's death, the Emperor sent Stabius to look for the Hunibald manuscript, he found among the abbot's papers the alleged extracts, altered and rewritten in several different forms.

Mennel now gave up both his old genealogies, but found a new one, landing Maximilian's ancestral line safely once more with Hector of Troy. In 1518 Maximilian and his council of scholars accepted this as correct.

But the history-loving Emperor was not satisfied that he had gotten to the bottom of things, so during his stay in Augsburg he occupied his time with Mennel in historical researches to trace his line back to Noah. This was a little too much for Kunz von der Rosen, a nobleman in the imperial household—part friend and part jester—who had earned great license by risking his life to save Maximilian from the hands of his rebellious Netherland subjects.¹ He called from the streets two disreputable characters, a man and a woman, and took them into the room where Maximilian and Mennel were pursuing their studies. They begged pensions from Maximilian because they were his kinsfolk, being descendants of Abraham. He gave them a couple of coins, and when they persisted, ordered them out. Kunz commenced to laugh and then Maximilian began to see the meaning of the parable. "Dear Kaiser, and thou Mennel", said Kunz, "aren't you a pair of fools? It isn't possible to trace out for the Emperor a long genealogy without finding for him a great many disreputable relatives".²

The Emperor's sense of humor always seems to have been in abeyance where his own person or his family were concerned, and he could not see the sense behind this folly. It is doubtful whether Mennel was so obtuse.

But being on Biblical ground with his family history the Emperor was afraid of blundering into heresy without intending it. He appealed therefore to the theological faculty of the University of Vienna he had done so much to raise to a commanding position. He asked them for an opinion on his line of descent from Noah to Sicamber, the grandson of Hector. The faculty appointed a com-

¹ This rests on tradition, but on good tradition. Maximilian's affection for Kunz and the great license he allowed him are established by other anecdotes besides the one here given.

² Quoted in *Deutscher Kunstblatt*, Vol. V., by E. Harzen, from the manuscript of Fugger's *Ehrenspiegel des Hauses Oesterreich*. The printed copy of this work, more often quoted popularly than any other source on Maximilian, ought not to be used without great caution. Ranke has shown that it is largely interpolated and untrustworthy.

mittee to examine the question. Their report, which still exists, is a very discreet document. On some steps of descent it makes no comment whatever. To other names it appends a list of passages from authors referring to them. To some it puts an interrogation mark (*in ambiguo est*). In regard to Sicamber, it appends a judicious note which is quite a model in the difficult art of steering between falsehood and offense. "Quis autem fuit is Siccambrus quem Turnus genuerit nihil quod afferamus habemus certi." What the Emperor would have done with this report, we cannot say, for he died a month after he asked for it. But in the *Weiss Kunig* Noah appears as his direct ancestor, a fact, it goes on to say, "which had been forgotten and the old writings neglected and lost until by sending learned men without regard to cost to search in all cloisters for books and to ask all scholars, the *Weiss Kunig* had proved it from one father to another (step by step)".

The story of his patronage of genealogy is characteristic enough of his attitude toward history; and this in an age when Reuchlin and Erasmus, Machiavelli, Guicciardini and Thomas More were all living!

Under this head of books which Maximilian caused to be made should be included his *Zeugbücher*, or accounts of the contents of his arsenals, contained in some six hundred and seventy pages of three manuscript volumes. Maximilian took pains to revise and make suggestions about the preparation of these catalogues, which are provided with rhymed verses. The verses and the arrangement often point out the improvements in material of war, notably in cannon, made by Maximilian.

The third branch of his book-making activity was the oversight of illustrations and planning sets of wood-cuts. Every one of his books was illustrated, and the Emperor took the greatest pains about the wood-cuts, inspecting rough sketches, suggesting alterations, rejecting entire plates.

Every leaf of the *Zeugbücher* has a picture. The *Fischereibuch*, a list of his fishing preserves, has five pictures; the *Jagdbuch*, a catalogue of his hunting preserves, has eight. On every page of the Prayer-Book the genius of Albrecht Dürer has surrounded petitions breathing the spirit of the monk and the crusader with a wealth of marginal ornament filled with the joy of life and beauty as it woke again in the Renaissance. *Teuerdank* has over a hundred illustrations. *Weiss Kunig* has about two hundred and fifty, the *Saints of the House of Hapsburg* more than a hundred, the *genealogy*, seventy odd.

But the activity of Maximilian in giving expression to his ideas

in pictures was not limited to these illustrations of a text. His object in pursuing literature and patronizing art was fame. He has given it words in the *Weiss Kunig*. A lord once blamed him because the money he spent "for remembrance" was lost. The *Weiss Kunig* answered, "Who does not make for himself in his life remembrance, he has after his death no remembrance and is forgotten with the toll of the bell. And therefore the gold I spend for remembrance is not lost, but the gold I save in the matter of memorials is a lessening of my future remembrance. And what I do not finish for my remembrance in my lifetime will not be made up for, either by thee or anyone else".

The great tomb that he planned was one of his means to secure remembrance. His written works were another. But in the art of engraving on wood, then flourishing in Germany, he saw a means of keeping his "remembrance" vivid among those who could neither read his books nor visit his tomb. He planned, therefore, several series of wood-cuts to record his glory. *Freydal* was an introduction to *Tuerdank*. It described in allegorical form the wooing of Mary of Burgundy by the Knight Freydal (Maximilian), who, after the fashion of chivalry, takes a trip through sixty-four courts to hold tournament and gain honor. The text is very short and occupies less than one-tenth of the space of the two hundred and fifty-five water-color illustrations made under the careful supervision of the Emperor as models for the wood-engraver. He fights three times at each court and honors its lady with a "mummerei," or masked dance. Of course, Maximilian took no such journey. The editor of the manuscript says that in the allegorical form Maximilian did not forget the historical content. This means only that when Maximilian dictated the short accounts of these games he seems to have had actual tournaments in mind, for usually the Emperor's adversary is named. Two-thirds of the tournaments come to no decisive results. In four-fifths of those that do lead to decisive results, Maximilian appears as victor.

Two similar series of wood-cuts were executed under Maximilian's direction. The one hundred and thirty-five plates of the *Triumphal Procession* show by symbolic figures his achievements as an athlete, sportsman and society leader; the provinces he ruled, his battles, treaties and marriages. The one hundred and ninety plates of the *Triumphal Arch*, when put together, form the largest wood-cut in existence, recording in symbolic form the glories of his family and his reign. And the genius of some of the men who held the pencil and burin for these thirteen hundred illustrations of his glory, has

thrown around the works of Maximilian a charm which is neither in his style nor in his ideas.

Popular tradition is sometimes very gentle to men. If there is anything in a ruler the people like, their memory adorns his figure as the evening light gives an unreal beauty. The courage, the vivacity, the tactful manners, the amiable personality of Maximilian made the Germans forget his faults. If he thought of Germany as anything but a background for the glory of the House of Hapsburg, it does not appear in what he did or wrote. Yet in tradition he is the typical Kaiser of the German folk. Foreign contemporaries all speak of him as lacking in ability, reckless in undertaking, slow in execution, over daring in ideals, infirm of purpose. Yet the Germans took at its face value that most spurious of all literary coin, the praises of the humanists of the early sixteenth century. The student of his writings finds in every page traces of some fundamental qualities of the real man. He was intensely egoistic. Insatiable family pride possessed him. His dull and prosaic mind delighted in the exercise of a weak imagination that ignored instead of mastering facts. He found great pleasure in grandiose planning. He shrank from the monotonous work of execution. These characteristics did not prevent him from being a most successful manager of the family interests of the Hapsburgs. They did prevent him from becoming a great statesman. And these characteristics which determined his career are written large in his literary work.

PAUL VAN DYKE.

THE MANOR OF EAST GREENWICH IN THE COUNTY OF KENT

STUDENTS of the American colonial charters will remember that in the three charters of Virginia granted by James I. successively in 1606, 1609 and 1612, in the New England charter of 1620, in the Massachusetts Bay charter granted by Charles I. in 1629, and that to Sir Ferdinando Gorges for Maine in 1639, and in the grants of Charles II. for the Carolinas in 1663 and 1665, for Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in 1663, and to the Duke of York for New York and New Jersey in 1664 and 1674, it is provided that the land is to be held of the king of England "as of the Manor of East Greenwich in the County of Kent, in free and common soccage and not *in capite* or by knight's service". The question naturally arises whether there is any particular significance in this often repeated expression, and if so, what. Why should the land granted in the New World be held from some manor and not from the crown direct? Why was free and common soccage preferred to knight's service? And why should East Greenwich be chosen rather than any other royal manor as the one from which the colonial lands were in so many cases to be held? For among all the colonial charters the only variations in this respect are those of Maryland in 1632 and Pennsylvania in 1681, where the castle of Windsor in the county of Berks is substituted for the Manor of East Greenwich in the county of Kent, and that of Georgia in 1732, which refers to the honor of Hampton Court in the county of Surrey. The first two of the questions brought up are legal in their nature and have perhaps been sufficiently discussed by others. But the prominence of the Manor of East Greenwich in the formula still suggests the question whether there was anything peculiar about it that made it especially suited to serve the purposes of those who granted or those who received the colonial charters.

East Greenwich is the old name of the modern Greenwich, as distinguished from West Greenwich, the modern Deptford, and lies on the Thames four miles below London Bridge, extending back from the river far enough to include in its boundaries the waste extent of Blackheath. An examination of the customs of the manor does not disclose anything very characteristic or unusual. A careful survey and inquiry was made in 1695. The jurors sworn for this

inquiry, after describing the demesne lands, reported that there were some two hundred and sixty-eight free tenants holding land within the manor, but no copyhold tenants. Each of the freeholders owed suit and service to the manor courts, paid a small annual sum as quit-rent, and ought to pay an additional year's rent by way of relief when his lands changed hands by descent or sale. The tenants also had a right of common pasture on Blackheath. There was nominally a court leet and a court baron, but at the time of the survey neither had been held for a long time. Waifs, estrays, felons' goods, treasure trove and such regalities and profits belonged to the king, as lord of the manor.¹ This is a very narrow and commonplace group of manorial customs and certainly includes nothing specially applicable to vast tracts in distant lands.

The special importance of East Greenwich for the colonies is seen to be still less when it is noted that a great amount of land in England itself was granted from the crown to be held from the same manor, quite apart from the land of the two or three hundred tenants on the manor described in the survey. A memorial to Elizabeth in 1600 says that "Synce the death of king Henrye the Eighth all persons for the most part which have purchased any landes of the king or of her Majestie or els exchanged any landes with her Highness, do acostumably (for the ease of their tenures and services and for that they will avoide to be called by writte for respect of homage) desire to holde theire landes in free soccage as of her majesties manor of Estgrenewich, wherebye the number of them that holde of the said manor are at this daie becom infynite. . . . There are in England dyspersyd thrugh all the partes of this Realme above ten thousand sundrie tenants that holde landes of the said manor. . . . The landes that are holden of Estgrenewich amounte farr above the sum of £30,000 per annum thrugh the Realme of Englande".² The number of tenants and value of lands so granted were probably vastly exaggerated in this report, which was from some one seeking the office of steward for the purpose of shearing this large flock in the interest of the queen and himself. Nevertheless, a glance at the actual procedure in the disposal of crown lands shows the general truth of his statement of the custom. Taking a chance example, in May, 1590, Elizabeth's commissioners for the sale of lands sold for the sum of £1857 15s. 3d. to Robert Paddow and John Moldsworth a number of pieces of land situated

¹ A Survey of His Majesty's Lordship or Manor of East Greenwich in the County of Kent, printed in full in John Kimbell, *Legacies and Charities of Greenwich*, pp. 183-226.

² State Papers, Dom., Eliz., CCLXXVI, 67.

in various counties. A long and detailed description of the lands on the patent roll closes by stating that all these lands are to be held "*de nobis, heredibus nostris et successoribus ut de manerio nostro de Estgrenewich in comitatu nostro de Kent, per fidelitatem tantum, in libero et communi soccagio et non in capite nec per servicium militum*".¹ This is only one of hundreds of deeds that use the same words. It is evident, therefore, that long before there were any grants of colonial lands this formula was in familiar use.

The facts of the case seem to be as follows. As a result of the confiscations of the possessions of the monasteries in the time of Henry VIII. and of other corporations in the reign of Edward VI. the extent of the crown lands was vastly increased. The Court of Augmentations which was formed to take charge of these lands became one of the most important of those half-administrative, half-judicial boards which were so active in the time of the Tudors and early Stuarts, and fifty years after its formation it still had a formidable organization of chancellor, surveyors, attorney, solicitor, etc., and officials in every county.² The amount of land at the disposal of the crown was kept up during the remainder of the sixteenth century by the numerous forfeitures for treason of the estates of great nobles.

Under Henry VIII. these lands were given or sold for nominal prices and with the most lavish profusion to personal favorites of the king and others who had court influence, and were generally granted to be held directly from the king for some small fractional part of a knight's fee, such as one-twentieth, one-thirtieth, or one-fortieth. A fair instance of this policy may be found in the grant on March 13, 1545, to Charles, Duke of Suffolk, of some seventy manors and properties in manors, for no purchase price, to be held from the king *in capite*, for one-twentieth of a knight's fee.³ Yet before the end of Henry's reign there are evidences that a more business-like treatment of crown lands was being introduced. Many grants were made to speculators in land or to *bona fide* purchasers. For these lands a considerable initial payment was made, and although sometimes required to be held *in capite*, they were much more frequently granted in soccage, to be held on condition of some small payment in money or money's worth from some manor belonging to the crown. Different manors are named in the deeds of the latter years of Henry VIII. and the early years of Edward VI. Bardney,

¹ Patent Roll, 32 Eliz., pt. 8, m. 10.

² State Papers, Dom., Eliz., CCXXI.

³ Public Record Office Cal. of Deeds, Henry VII. and Henry VIII., Co. Lincoln, p. 46. See also Patent Rolls of Henry VIII.

Swynshedd, Louth, Shenstone, the honors of Bolingbroke and of Hampton Court, and many others are used more or less frequently, the manor chosen being in many cases located in the neighborhood of the estates conveyed. But about the third year of Edward VI., that is to say, 1550, East Greenwich begins to emerge as the most usually chosen manor, and within three or four years it had practically superseded all others. A grant is occasionally made to be held from some other royal manor, but very infrequently indeed. As the naming of a manor was only a form there was obviously a convenience in using always the same form. It was therefore but natural that the variety of manors named in the earlier grants should soon give way to some one regularly chosen. Lands continued also to be granted from time to time *in capite*, for a nominal amount of knight's service, but these instances also became less and less usual. In the vast proportion of cases after the year 1554 the formula "to be held in free and common soccage as of the manor of East Greenwich in the county of Kent", expressed either in Latin or in English, had become as well established as any of the other legal forms in royal charters.¹

Even the lands which Queen Mary restored to religious bodies were to be held on this tenure, and in Elizabeth's ordinary grants there seem to have been very few exceptions to it. It is true that occasionally estates were given away by her, as by her predecessors and successors, to royal favorites, but it was for the most part the financial needs of the crown that led to the successive sales of crown lands. These were therefore made purely on business principles, in such a way as to obtain for them the most ready money possible. To take again a chance instance, in November, 1589, Elizabeth instructed the lord chancellor, lord treasurer, and various other commissioners to sell for the "expenses of the defense of the realme" crown lands to the value of £1000 a year, giving minute instructions as to what lands were and were not to be sold, and as to the terms of sale.² Purchasers were urged on patriotic grounds to pay a good price for the land, but at the same time every other inducement was given them to buy, and a well established form of tenure, without feudal burdens, from a definite and customary source, was no slight advantage, and may well have helped to perpetuate the custom.

Thus it appears that the formula "to be held from East Greenwich etc.", had been in use for fifty years and more before the first grants of King James to the colonies, and a further examination of

¹ Pub. Rec. Off. Cal. of Deeds, Edw. VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, Counties of Lincoln, Nottingham, Oxford, and Essex.

² State Pap. Dom., Eliz., CCXXVIII, 3.

the records shows that it was being used in his time for crown grants in England as well as in America.¹

There is no means of discovering with certainty the reason for the choice of East Greenwich by the commissioners for the sale of lands or the officers who drew up grants in the early years of Edward VI. No order of the Court of Augmentations or of any other authority has been found giving definite instructions on the point. But there can be little doubt that Greenwich was settled upon because it was the most usual dwelling-place of the king at that time. Where the king was the court was, and necessarily therefore the officials who had charge of the sale of lands. It might be anticipated that Westminster should have chosen, as it also was an occasional residence of the king, and the permanent location of the law-courts and of a considerable body of clerks; but apart from the less frequent stay of the court there, Westminster was not a manor, and therefore was not available.

The Tudor sovereigns were all partial to Greenwich. Lands and an ancient dwelling there had belonged to the crown at least from the early fifteenth century. Henry VII. rebuilt and extended the palace and spent much of his time there. Even in the most active years of his life he was apt to spend Sunday and almost certain to keep Christmas at Greenwich and here his two younger children, Henry and Mary, were born. Henry VIII. improved the palace and rounded out the grounds by acquiring land by exchange from the abbots of Shene and Westminster. He also bought lands in the vicinity and made a neighborly gift of them to Anne Boleyn when she was created Marchioness of Pembroke. Here he, like his father, spent much of his time, and especially seasons of festivity. The music, the shows, the jousts, the banquets, and all the semi-barbaric magnificence that characterized the court of the later Tudors grew up pre-eminently about the palace of Greenwich. It was connected equally closely with Henry's domestic life. It was here that he was married to Catherine in 1509; here that Anne Boleyn lived by preference both before and during her short life as queen, here that Mary and Elizabeth were born and baptized, and it was here that Henry brought his fourth wife, Anne of Cleves, to spend her few weeks of married life. Chapters of the Order of the Garter, the visits of the Emperor Charles V. and afterwards of King Christian of Denmark, receptions of formal embassies, and important meetings of the privy council, intermingled with wed-

¹ Pub. Rec. Off. Cal. of Deeds, Vol. 28.

dings, mayings, tournaments, and masks gave it a political as well as a domestic and festive character as a royal court.¹

The reign of Edward VI. was no exception to this family predilection for Greenwich. The court of the young king was established there promptly after the organization of the Protectorate, and although he was often at his other palaces, especially Westminster, it was at Greenwich that most of his short reign was spent. In 1552 he was there for his last Christmas, and there in the succeeding July he died. During the years 1550 and 1551, in which the custom of making land-grants to be held of the manor of East Greenwich was becoming established, the king and court were there more than at all other royal dwelling-places together.² Mary followed the same custom, and during the long reign of Elizabeth this was still the most favored of all the palaces and royal seats. However frequently she might visit Somerset House or Hampton Court or Oatlands or Richmond or Windsor, or however extended might be the "progresses," during which she was the guest successively of various noblemen, gentlemen, towns and colleges, she always returned to Greenwich. From the palace windows there she watched successive expeditions of discovery or enterprise float down the Thames and greeted a few successfully returning. Here more than one traveller from the Continent noted the magnificence and ceremony of her court, and more than one suitor and ambassador tried his skill against her astuteness and tergiversation.

James I. preferred other royal dwellings, and with his accession Greenwich, like much more that belonged to the sixteenth century, passed under a cloud. But this was no longer important from the point of view of the form of crown grants. Both at the time of the creation of the custom and during the period when it was becoming fixed, Greenwich was in every way the most natural place to be chosen as a source of tenure, and by the time of the Stuarts the custom had obtained the same rigidity as other legal formulas. Its use in the charters given to the colonies by James and his successors is thus quite explicable. But after all it had little if any real significance for the colonies. It was simply an adaptation to land beyond the sea of a form originally used in the grant of crown lands in England. Its use may be taken to represent the closeness of legal connection between the colony and the home government,—that America was, in the view of the king, simply an extension of the soil of England. Actual conditions and the logic of events brought about a very different relation between the colonies and the mother

¹ Hasted, *History of Kent*, I. 57-61.

² *Acts of the Privy Council* n. s. II. 424-432; III. 3-55, 181-460.

country from that which was anticipated in the forms used in the royal grants of land. Apart from such vague suggestions as these the result of inquiry into the meaning and significance of the familiar expression of the charters is negative rather than positive. East Greenwich was no different from any other manor; its customs were not peculiar, its tenure was not especially significant, its mention in the colonial charters did not bring the colonies into any relationship with it. So far as the colonial charters are concerned, East Greenwich was merely an empty name.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

BURKE ON PARTY

BURKE was a great political teacher. He has had a great and good influence on public character in England. But he is not, like Hobbes, Montesquieu, Hume or Bentham, a calm inquirer meditating in his closet. He is always in the political arena. His works are pamphlets and speeches, called forth by the controversy of the hour, and require to be read with full allowance for the occasion which gave them birth. It is as an authority on finance and trade that he is least subject to qualification on this account. Called an adventurer, and being one in the literal sense of the term, he had, unlike the ordinary adventurer, taken the utmost pains to qualify himself for the public service by a profound study of all the subjects with which as a statesman he would have to deal. His knowledge of economical and commercial questions is wonderful considering that such knowledge was far less accessible to him in those days than it would be now; that he had never been practically engaged in commerce; and that he was thirty-seven years old when the *Wealth of Nations* appeared. In Burke's works and in the speeches of Daniel Webster before his change of line free traders will find some of the keenest shafts for their controversial quiver.

It is in a pamphlet eminently polemical that we read the well-known vindication of political party, so often cited by upholders of the party system of government.

"Party is a body of men united, for promoting by their joint endeavours the national interest, upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed. For my part, I find it impossible to conceive that any one believes in his own politicks, or thinks them to be of any weight, who refuses to adopt the means of having them reduced into practice. It is the business of the speculative philosopher to mark the proper ends of government. It is the business of the politician, who is the philosopher in action, to find out proper means towards those ends, and to employ them with effect. Therefore, every honourable connexion will avow it is their first purpose to pursue every just method to put the men who hold their opinions into such a condition as may enable them to carry their common plans into execution, with all the power and authority of the state. As this power is attached to certain situations, it is their duty to contend for these situations. Without a proscription of others, they

are bound to give to their own party the preference in all things; and by no means, for private considerations, to accept any offers of power in which the whole body is not included; nor to suffer themselves to be led, or to be controuled, or to be overbalanced, in office or in council, by those who contradict the very fundamental principles on which their party is formed, and even those upon which every fair connexion must stand. Such a generous contention for power, on such manly and honourable maxims, will easily be distinguished from the mean and interested struggle for place and emolument. The very style of such persons will serve to discriminate them from those numberless impostors, who have deluded the ignorant with professions incompatible with human practice, and have afterwards incensed them by practices below the level of vulgar rectitude."

Montesquieu or Bentham would not fail to tell us exactly what he means by "principle". Is it a general principle of political morality or expediency? About these we are all agreed; they are subjects of debate but can furnish no foundation for a party. Is it agreement on a particular question? A particular question, however momentous, even though it may be important enough to warrant a good citizen in temporary devotion to a party flag, will in time be settled. When it has been settled, what will then be left to warrant the continuance of the party tie? What will there be to bar the conversion of the party into a faction the leaders of which will fight for place with intrigue, calumny and corruption, while the followers will be held together by a shibboleth? This passage, which has been a frontlet between the eyes of devotees of the party system, requires, to be construed aright, the historical key.

Those who contend that party is a universal necessity of constitutional government are like the British footman who, seeing a French soldier in blue uniform, said that everybody knew that blue for a uniform was absurd except in the Artillery and the Horse Guards, Blue. Though there were forestallings of the party system under Charles II., the system really dates from the time when William III. found it necessary, as in his situation it certainly was, to compose his council entirely of men of the party who had set him on his throne. The Cabal in the time of Charles II. had been something like a Cabinet; but it was in reality what the name now imports; and it did not rest like the cabinet on the support of an organized party in Parliament. The constitutional executive of England was, and in the contemplation of law still is, the Privy Council, composed of men chosen as being highly qualified for the service of the crown and the state without reference to their gen-

eral opinions, in which they sometimes differed widely from each other. Under the monarchy, the members of the Privy Council were nominated by the king. The members of the Council of State, which under the Commonwealth took the place and assumed the functions of the Privy Council, were appointed by a process combining nomination with election. Should democracy with the party system ever break down, the Instrument of Government, in which the constitution of the Commonwealth was embodied, may deserve the attention of those to whose lot it may fall to conduct the necessary revolution.

So long as the struggle between the Hanoverians and the Stuarts, with their respective political creeds, continued, there was manifest ground for a division of parties in Parliament and at the polls, as well as on the fields of Sheriffmuir and Culloden. When that struggle closed in the collapse of the Stuarts, party broke into "connections", formed round the great houses, Pelham, Bedford, Rockingham, Granville, strong in their nomination boroughs and their territorial influence. The connections struggled against each other for power and place, while the tendency of all of them alike was to transfer the real control from the king to the minister with his train. George III., on the other hand, had imbibed the counsel of his mother, who was always bidding him "be a King". He was by no means inclined to be the puppet of his Mayor of the Palace. Personal government by prerogative, bare-faced, was no longer possible. In place of it was set on foot personal government by influence, the instruments of which were a regiment of sycophants styling themselves King's Friends, who held their votes in Parliament entirely at the disposal of the king, and when he gave the word thwarted the policy of his constitutional advisers. To put an end to the ascendancy of faction and restore the authority of the head of the whole nation was the professed object of the King's Friends. Chatham, on the other hand, standing apart in his towering popularity, wanted a parliamentary autocracy of Chatham. He refused to combine with the Rockingham connection, to which Burke belonged, and formed under himself a departmental ministry of men unconnected with each other, his leadership being the only bond of union, while he kept all the power in his own hands. The chief portion of the *Thoughts on the Present Discontents* is directed against "Influence" and the King's Friends; the concluding part is a satirical attack on the autocratic administration of Chatham with his set of departmental subordinates, political strangers to each other. No personal government by influence, no autocracy of Chatham, but constitutional government with the Rockingham

connection in power, is the moral of the pamphlet and the key to its interpretation.

Not much support, therefore, can be found in the arguments of Burke's pamphlet for a system which cuts a nation perpetually in two, and sets the halves to wage everlasting war with each other for possession of the government with the familiar weapons of faction. Upholders of the system, at a loss for a permanent ground of division, have been fain to have recourse to the comic opera, and to maintain that each of us is born a little Conservative or a little Liberal. It is needless to say that there is no such bisection of human character. Its shades melt indistinguishably into each other. What would Burke himself have said to the constitution of a country perpetually divided into two party organizations recognized by law, always remaining on foot and fighting periodically with a fury approaching that of civil war, while not only the special issues but the vital character of each party underwent from time to time complete change? Would he not have said that such a commonwealth was in a perilous condition? Would he in so saying have been far wrong? Looking not to organization, but to character, who would recognize the identity of the Republican party in the United States, as it is now, with the Republican party before or even during the war?

Chatham's autocracy was killed by the gout, combined with waywardness on the part of the autocrat. That in its headless state it brought on the American Revolution by taxing the colonies may be said to have been partly chargeable to the philosophy of Burke. Contempt for political theory, indifference to constitutional forms, regard solely to the practical policy and conduct of government, were not only the tendencies but the constant professions of Burke, who was the very opposite of Sieyès. Burke, no doubt, drew for the Rockinghams the Declaratory Act affirming the power of Parliament to legislate on all subjects for the colonies, under the shelter of which the British Government sought to withdraw with dignity when it was compelled to repeal the stamp tax. Burke thought the form was of no practical importance inasmuch as it was certain that no dangerous use if any use at all would ever be made of the power. The sequel is too well known.

Burke carried his disregard of theoretic perfection compared with practical expediency to an excessive length. He fought against any reform of Parliament with its petty Cornish constituencies, its unenfranchised Manchester and Birmingham, its Gatton and its Old Sarum, its nomination boroughs and open sale of seats. He even wished to reduce the extent of the franchise on the ground of the

disorders attending popular elections. That the institution worked well, at least in his opinion, was enough. But an institution which shocked common sense, though it might happen to be working well or not very ill, could not fail to be morally weak. An anomaly, even one harmless in itself, is an evil if it diminishes the citizens' respect for the institutions of the state. In the American Senate, where power now centres, New York has not more representatives than Nevada. We are assured that this theoretic imperfection is no practical evil. The future will probably show.

On the death of Chatham, "Influence" triumphed, with Lord North for its parliamentary agent, and put "faction", that is the independence of Parliament, under its feet. Yorktown was ruin to it for a moment, but it recovered itself by an intrigue for which the opportunity was given it through the reaction against the North and Fox coalition, and the unpopularity of the India Bill; though after all it found that it had given itself a master instead of a tool in the young Pitt.

A strange realization of Burke's ideal of party was that coalition of Fox and North, in which he held the office of paymaster of the forces, and signalized his own patriotism by renunciation of its irregular gains. The members of his ideal party were to be united not by political sympathy only but by personal esteem and confidence. The model was the group of Whig statesmen beloved and lauded by Addison. Between the two heads of the coalition there had been not only dissension the most violent on the great question of the day, but personal enmity of the bitterest kind. Fox had threatened North with impeachment and denounced him as a man lost to honor, connection with whom would be infamy. Their two sections had joined battle in the Wilkes case, on the issues of liberty of speech and publicity in the proceedings of Parliament. The saying that enmities were short but friendships were eternal had a fine sound, but hardly covered a sudden reversal, for the sake of place, of one man's opinion of the character of another. Burke had no business in the coalition government. But he had lost a worthy leader in Rockingham, and found one much less worthy, though far superior in ability, and as a political athlete, in Fox, a man brought up under the paternal roof of the most unscrupulous intriguer of the day, a debauchee, and a desperate gambler. In Fox Burke had the most attractive of companions and the worst of political guides.

The force which carried Pitt into power was not party but hatred of the coalition with its India Bill and feeling in favor of the son of Chatham, combined with the influence of the Crown. There were Radicals as well as Tories in Pitt's original majority.

When division was formed afresh by the outbreak of the French Revolution, Burke burst his party tie and broke violently with the leader of the Whigs.

There is a common impression that Burke was a great statesman destined by nature for the highest trust, but by the narrow jealousy of the Whig oligarchy kept out of his due. This notion was fostered by Disraeli, whom the Whigs had failed to appreciate, and who identified himself with Burke, taking his title of Beaconsfield from the great man's home. The impression derives some color from a passage in the *Thoughts on the Present Discontents* where the writer avows that the part of the constitution which he would be most content to resign is aristocracy, "that austere and insolent domination"; as well as from the encounter with the Duke of Bedford. But there could hardly be a greater type of Whig aristocracy than Rockingham, who introduced Burke into public life and seems to have treated his illustrious secretary as a colleague, though Burke somewhat compromised his position by the acceptance of pecuniary favors from Rockingham. We have perhaps rather over-rated the effect of aristocratic exclusiveness generally in shutting the gate at that period against political merit. Three prime ministers, Addington, Jenkinson and Canning, were distinctly plebeians. Sheridan fought under no cold shade. A number of names might be cited, not distinctly plebeian, yet not in the full sense aristocratic, the holders of which found their way to high place. The vehemence of Burke's temper, which was the Celtic part of his character, and the violence of his impulses, caused him, even when he was battling for the right, to commit errors of judgment and taste which cost him the confidence of the House of Commons and made those who witnessed them speak of him as insane. Insanity itself, indeed, could hardly have been less of a qualification for dealing with high matters of state than the fury which broke all bounds not only of good sense and moderation, but of the commonest decency, in Burke's conduct in the impeachment of Warren Hastings. The *Reflections on the French Revolution*, recklessly inflaming public feeling at the most dangerous of all possible junctures, when it was the manifest object of statesmanship to keep it cool, is another proof of the unfitness of the author for the highest trust. Further proofs were the relations into which Burke got with the frenzied émigrés and his own passionate outcries for war.

Burke's works are a school of political wisdom as well as of noble sentiment, but it is always to be borne in mind that he is an orator and a pamphleteer.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

THE CONFEDERATION AND THE SHAYS REBELLION

THE Shays Rebellion may be said to have begun at Northampton, Massachusetts, on August 29, 1786. There had been a considerable time of preliminary agitation, but on that occasion was seen the first forcible defiance to the government. A mob seized the court-house and prevented the sitting of the Court of Common Pleas and General Sessions of the Peace. The purpose of the rioters was to put an end to legal proceedings for enforcing the payment of debts and taxes. The example set at Northampton was quickly followed throughout the greater portion of the state, and for months the course of justice was seriously obstructed or altogether stopped.¹ As was to be expected, these first steps in rebellion soon led much farther. The insurgents feared that in the Supreme Court indictments for treason would be returned against them. Consequently, they assembled in sufficient numbers completely to paralyze the proceedings of that court at Springfield in the last week of September.² Till the following March the Supreme Court was seen no more in western Massachusetts.

Such extensive opposition to the government could not be maintained without extensive organization. The insurgents therefore attempted to keep up considerable bodies of men, to organize some sort of leadership and co-operation, and to provide themselves with arms and ammunition. All this made the movement seem more far-reaching than it really was. Many conservative and influential persons believed that the insurgents desired to overthrow the state government, and to establish some purely democratic or even communistic system in its place. The present writer believes, for reasons which need not here be given, that this interpretation of the aims of the rebellion was unjust to most of the participants. Nevertheless, it was the accepted view of the political aristocracy of Massachusetts, and it was this view which finally roused them to the stroke by which the insurrection was crushed. In January, 1787, Governor

¹ On this subject there is in the Massachusetts Archives, at the State House in Boston, a wealth of unpublished correspondence between the governor and judges, sheriffs, militia officers, and interested citizens.

² Supreme Judicial Court Record, 1786, folio 405, Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court, Court-House, Boston; Massachusetts Archives, CLXXXIX. 20-21; CXC. 265, 266, 289-292; *Boston Magazine*, III. 404.

Bowdoin, who charged the insurgents with "a contempt of all constitutional government, and a fixed determination to persevere in measures for subverting it,"¹ sent against them Major-General Benjamin Lincoln, who believed that their aim was to "sap the foundations of our constitution" in order that, "when an end should be put to public and private debts, the agrarian law might follow."² Lincoln with his strong force of trustworthy militia soon overpowered all opposition; but this force could not have been dispatched, had not the wealthy men of Boston and other towns made up a subscription of nearly twenty thousand dollars. Lincoln himself raised this fund, telling the contributors that it was simply a question of advancing part of their property in order to save the rest.³

Meantime, the Shays Rebellion attracted wide attention throughout the country. The attitude taken towards it by the leading politicians in other states closely reflected that of their brethren in Massachusetts. Not only were the insurgents believed to have subversive purposes, but suspicions were also expressed—quite without foundation, it appears—that they were instigated by British emissaries. Others feared, or hoped, that a monarchy might be established. It is, further, well known that the insurrection gave a strong impulse towards the assembling of the Federal Convention and to the labors of that body for the establishment of a strong national government. Especially is the mark of the Shays Rebellion seen in the constitutional guarantee to every state of a republican form of government and of protection, on application, against domestic violence.

Another matter, closely related to those just mentioned, is the action taken by the federal government with reference to the rebellion. This subject, which was for months a leading question of national politics, seems never to have been seriously investigated. The histories merely tell us that Congress voted to raise troops, pretending that they were needed against the Indians, but really purposing to assist the government of Massachusetts. But how this curious plan originated, whether the danger from the Indians was real

¹ Speech to the General Court, February 3, 1787, *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts, 1786-87*, 960.

² Lincoln to Washington, December 4, 1786. The original of this important account of the Shays Rebellion is in the Department of State at Washington. It is dated December 4, 1786, and February 22 and March 4, 1787. There is a copy among the manuscripts of Jared Sparks (Harvard University Library, Sparks MSS., LVII).

³ *Ibid.*; Stephen Higginson to Henry Knox, Boston, January 20, 1787, *Letters of Stephen Higginson, Report of the American Historical Association, 1896*, I, 743-745.

or fabricated, whether the Massachusetts authorities wished for federal intervention, what degree or lack of co-operation existed between the state and national governments, how many troops were actually raised, what purpose, if any, they ever served, and what became of them when the insurrection was over—these and other interesting questions have remained almost totally unanswered.

Two reasons prompted Congress to take serious heed of the rebellion. The first was the fear that the government of Massachusetts—perhaps the governments of all the states—might be overthrown. The other was the imminent danger that the insurgents might capture the national arsenal at Springfield. In 1777 Congress had selected Springfield as the most convenient place in New England for storing and distributing military supplies. Springfield had good water communication by the Connecticut river, and was at a safe distance from the sea. Ten acres of land had accordingly been leased from the town for ninety-nine years, and several large wooden buildings had been erected. These served as store-houses, workshops, and barracks. There had been added a foundry for casting brass cannon and a strongly built brick magazine. In 1786 there was at Springfield not less than four hundred and fifty tons of military stores, including some seven thousand new small-arms with bayonets, thirteen hundred barrels of powder, and a large quantity of shot and shell.¹ The seizure of all these munitions by the insurgents would have been a very serious matter. For the safety of the property General Henry Knox, the Secretary at War, was responsible. He was therefore in a position to play, as he did, the leading part in the episode under consideration—a part which has almost entirely escaped the notice of his biographers. A report from him, dated September 20, 1786, gave Congress its first official warning, so far as has been discovered, of the rising storm in Massachusetts.²

On a visit of inspection at Springfield about the middle of the month, Knox had seen that serious commotions were impending. He consulted various persons—among them Major-General William Shepard, who commanded the local militia—regarding possible danger to the federal property. It was clear that there was ground for anxiety. While the insurgents had apparently no matured designs upon the arsenal, they had talked of seizing it, if the government should attempt to punish them. A guard was needed, but how to

¹ Papers of the Old Congress, Library of Congress, Washington, No. 150, Letters of General Henry Knox, Secretary at War, I. 555-557 (Report to Congress, September 20, 1786); No. 151, Reports of Henry Knox, Secretary at War, 243-254 (Report to Congress, March 13, 1787). Cf. J. G. Holland, *History of Western Massachusetts*, I. 227.

² Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, I. 555-557.

provide it was a problem. Considering that Springfield was in the midst of a somewhat discontented population, Knox was afraid that a small guard might challenge attack rather than avert it. A large guard would involve large expense; and where was the money to be found? From this dilemma he sought escape by shifting the responsibility upon the government of the state. He wrote to Governor Bowdoin on September 16, setting forth his uneasiness about the Continental stores, and requesting such protection for them as the governor might think needful. The federal authorities, he took pains to explain, had refrained from setting a guard because they were confident of the fidelity of Massachusetts, and unwilling even to seem to call that fidelity in question. Moreover, it would have been expensive.¹

Governor Bowdoin promptly handed the responsibility back to Knox. The Secretary at War, he replied, knew better than he how strong a guard was required. He had therefore issued orders to General Shepard to raise whatever number of the Hampshire militia Knox might request. The latter, meantime, had returned to New York and had submitted the report of September 20. On receiving the governor's letter, he again addressed Congress, on September 28, asking whether Shepard should be ordered to raise a guard at once, or be left to act upon his own judgment. The latter course was the one which, under the circumstances, he recommended. The best solution of all, he said, would of course be to send to Springfield a body of four or five hundred federal troops. He refrained, however, for financial reasons, from pressing such action upon Congress. In reply Congress passed on September 29 its first vote with reference to the Shays Rebellion. The Secretary at War was directed to proceed to Springfield and there take such measures as he should judge necessary for the protection of the arsenal. Armed thus with complete authority from both Congress and the government of Massachusetts, Knox started at once for Springfield.² Before he reached that place, however, the first crisis had already arrived and passed.

Tuesday, September 26, had been set for the opening of a term of the Supreme Court at Springfield. For reasons stated above the insurgents decided to intervene. General Shepard, however, not only ordered out the militia, but also issued a call for volunteers. In

¹ *Ibid.*, 551-553 (Knox to Bowdoin, September 16, 1786); 567-571 (Report of Knox to Congress, September 28, 1786).

² *Ibid.*, 559 (Bowdoin to Knox, September 19, 1786); 567-571 (Report of Knox to Congress, September 28, 1786); 575 (Knox to the President of Congress, September 29, 1786); *Secret Journals of Congress*, I. (Domestic Affairs), 266-267.

response, eight or nine hundred men, including many of the leading citizens of the county, assembled to protect the court and guard the arsenal. They were so inadequately armed, however, that Shepard, though he had no permission from Knox, felt obliged to demand the key of the magazine, and take a field-piece and four hundred small-arms to supply his men. On the morning of the twenty-sixth the justices arrived. The insurgents were not far behind. Under the protection of Shepard's men the court was formally opened, but the justices seem to have been thoroughly frightened and transacted hardly any business. The insurgents, led by Daniel Shays, certainly made a threatening appearance. They marched past the court-house in military order with loaded pieces. They demanded that no indictments should be returned against their leaders, that judgments in civil cases should be suspended, and that the militia should disband. They even talked of attacking the troops and seizing the arsenal. One suspects, however, that all this was largely bravado, for, though the mob outnumbered General Shepard's force, they were so poorly armed that they would certainly have been worsted in a contest. Fortunately, by a curious device the danger of a collision was averted. At a conference between the insurgent leaders and the militia officers it was agreed that both parties should disband, and on Thursday afternoon this arrangement was faithfully carried out. On the same day the justices concluded their insignificant proceedings, adjourned *sine die*, and thankfully took their departure alive and safe. Quiet supervened, but three results were apparent—the session of the court had been a failure; the insurgents were elated by their success; the United States arsenal remained as defenceless as before.¹

When Knox reached Springfield, probably on the following Monday, he was greatly impressed with the gravity of the situation. He was convinced that the prestige of the state government was severely shaken, and that the insurgents were planning a complete political and social revolution.² As to the arsenal he was in greater perplexity than ever. He was sure that the insurgents would before long attempt its capture, but General Shepard's bargain with them stood in the way of raising a guard large enough to be of any

¹ On these occurrences at Springfield see note 2, p. 42; also Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, I. 579-580 (Shepard to Knox, Springfield, September 29, 1786); 583-584 (Knox to the President of Congress, Hartford, October 1, 1786); 587-590 (Knox to the President of Congress, Springfield, October 3, 1786).

² Knox MSS., New England Historic Genealogical Society, Boston, XIX. 23 (Knox to John Jay, Springfield, October 3, 1786); Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II. 67-71 (Report of Knox to the President of Congress, October 18, 1786).

service. Since nothing could be done at Springfield, Knox decided to appeal once more to Governor Bowdoin, and accordingly set out for Boston. Just what he wished the governor to do, he would probably have found it difficult to say. His reports show that he hoped to see at Springfield a strong body of militia recruited by the state government at state expense; but where this force was to be raised, and how it was to be brought to Springfield before the insurgents should have sacked the arsenal, his writings fail to explain.

On reaching Boston, Knox laid the matter before the governor, and the governor invited to confer with the Secretary and himself a number of his most confidential advisers. Among those present was Rufus King, at that time a member of Congress for Massachusetts.¹ At this meeting was developed the plan, which has always been ascribed to a committee of Congress, that the call for troops should originate with the national government. The first question discussed was whether the federal munitions should be protected at Springfield or removed. Every one present preferred the former course. To remove the stores would require as many men as to guard them, and the insurgents would think that they had frightened both the state and national governments. But how could the insurgents be kept quiet while the state was collecting its forces? The mere knowledge that the arsenal was to be protected might provoke an instant attack. To meet this difficulty the suggestion was made, and unanimously approved, that Congress, without referring to the insurrection, should request the state to furnish a quota of federal troops. It was hoped that in response to this call a force could be assembled without stirring up the insurgents. Having once secured

¹ The exact composition of this council is not certain. Knox described it in his letter of October 8 to the President of Congress as "Those gentlemen connected in the affairs of Government, with whom he consulted confidentially, on this occasion" (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II, 17-19). In the report of October 18 it is stated that "The gentlemen with whom he advised on my communications, were of the most respectable character in the state for their political knowledge" (*ibid.*, 67-71). Probably it was a gathering in which the three departments of the state government were all represented. Several such conferences had previously been held on the question of using troops to protect the courts. On September 7, for example, the governor had consulted the council, the justices of the Supreme Court, the attorney general, and such members of both houses of the General Court as were in Boston (Massachusetts Archives, CXC, 242-245).

The date of the meeting, also, is not exactly known. Since Knox, however, was in Springfield on October 3, and on the eighth wrote an account of the conference to the President of Congress, it was probably not earlier than the fifth nor later than the seventh of the month. There is, of course, no mention of the meeting in the files or minutes of the governor's council, for it could not be regarded as a meeting of that body.

these troops, the federal government might use them to protect its property.¹

It is impossible to say who originated this device. It is known, however, that King talked with Gerry on this visit to Massachusetts about the probability of an Indian war. A few days later he took an active part in pushing the requisition for troops through Congress. A plausible conjecture—though no more than a conjecture—would be that the artifice was his.² From whatever source it came, the plan must have strongly appealed to Knox. It seemed to promise complete success to his mission. As has been said, what he most desired was a guard of federal troops at Springfield. It will be seen, moreover, that, for reasons quite apart from the rebellion in Massachusetts, he wished such troops to be raised.

It remained to secure the help of Congress in the stratagem which had been devised. This was a somewhat delicate undertaking. Governor Bowdoin could hardly venture a request to Congress without permission from the General Court; but to breathe the project to the General Court would both betray the secret and defeat the plan. That assembly was not yet ready for decisive action against the insurgents by the state government, much less for federal intervention. The only way, therefore, was to leave the matter informally to the management of the Secretary at War and the Massachusetts delegates in Congress. Knox and King accordingly returned to New York. On the way the former made such arrangements as he could—in which he admitted that he had little faith—for the temporary safety of the arsenal. He directed General Shepard to watch the situation closely, and to call out the militia, if he should see signs of trouble. He also wrote to several Revolutionary officers, urging them to volunteer their services, if help should be required at Springfield. Finally, he arranged with Governor Huntington, of Connecticut, that, in case of need, twelve or fifteen hundred of the Connecticut militia should march to Shepard's assistance.³

On October 18 Congress received from Knox a full report upon the situation in Massachusetts. He spared no emphasis in depicting the dangerous tendencies which he ascribed to the rebellion. He declared that "great numbers of people in Massachusetts and the neighbouring states . . . avow the principle of annihilating all debts

¹ Knox to Congress, October 3, 8, and 18 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, I. 587-590; II. 17-19, 67-71).

² King to Gerry, October 19, 1786, *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, I. 191-192.

³ Knox's report of October 18; also letters to several officers (Knox MSS., XIX. 20, 22, 26, 27).

public and private. . . . It is my firm conviction," he added, "unless the present commotions are checked with a strong hand, that an armed tyranny may be established on the ruins of the present constitution." Nothing, he continued, short of a guard of five hundred men would suffice to protect the arsenal at Springfield. He therefore recommended that the force of seven hundred men then in the service of the United States¹ should be increased to fifteen hundred. The new recruits would guard the arsenal during the coming winter, and, "if they should not be requisite for the same purpose the next spring, they might be marched to the frontier, or disbanded as Congress should think most proper."

The report was committed to Messrs. Pettit, Lee, Pinckney, Henry, and Smith. On October 20 this committee presented a report and accompanying resolutions, all of which Congress unanimously approved. These votes provided for an increase in the army of thirteen hundred and forty non-commissioned officers and privates. The total non-commissioned force would then be two thousand and forty strong. Furthermore, nearly all the new recruits were to come from New England, and scarcely less than half from Massachusetts. Of infantry and artillery Rhode Island was to furnish one hundred and twenty men, Connecticut one hundred and eighty, New Hampshire two hundred and sixty, and Massachusetts six hundred and sixty. Outside of New England only Virginia and Maryland were called upon—each to supply a cavalry troop of sixty men. It was further voted that all possible haste should be urged upon the governments of these states; that the governors should be asked to assemble the legislatures, if they were not in session, in order that the quota might be promptly granted. Means for the support and payment of the troops should be devised and reported to Congress by the Board of Treasury.²

Now it would seem obvious that this action of Congress was due to the recent statements of Knox about the insurrection. On the contrary, nothing of the sort can be gathered from the committee's report. That document made no reference whatever to the crisis in Massachusetts. It did give, however, a highly colored account of impending danger from the western Indians. Papers had come in

¹ Knox to Bowdoin, October 22, 1786 (*ibid.*, 29). Cf. *Journals of Congress*, April 1, 7, and 12, 1785.

² *Journals of Congress*, XI, 186-188 (edition of 1801).

The resolution further provided that the recruits were to serve for three years, unless sooner disbanded. The Secretary at War was to call upon the governments of the states in which the troops were to be raised for such commissioned officers as their respective quotas required. Subject to order from the War Office, the Board of Treasury was to contract for clothing and rations.

from the War Office, according to the committee, filled with startling reports of the doings of several Indian nations. The Shawnees, Pottawattamies, Chippewas, Tawas, and Twightwees were mentioned in particular. These tribes were already gathering at the Shawnee towns; with them was a gang of desperados called Mingoes and Cherokees, outcasts from other tribes, who had banded together for war and plunder. A thousand warriors would soon be assembled; some had already started on the war-path. The southern Indians, as well as the northern, were discontented, and plans were afoot to unite all the tribes in a war against the United States. Nothing but the promptest measures could avert this dreadful calamity. This situation, said the committee, demanded that the army should be immediately increased. The western frontier and the settlements beyond towards the Mississippi river could then be defended. This protection would also hasten the surveying and sale of the western lands and the consequent reduction of the public debt.

Why did the committee say nothing about the insurrection in Massachusetts? The reason appeared in a secret report, presented on the following day by the same committee, and unanimously approved by Congress.¹ This paper dealt fully with affairs in Massachusetts. Referring for their facts to the report of General Knox "and other authentic information,"² the committee stated that a dangerous insurrection had broken out and was rapidly gaining ground in that state; that the legislature would not accept help from Congress, if it were offered openly, but that such help was none the less absolutely necessary.³ Indeed, unless it should be quickly given, it was probable that the arsenal at Springfield would be seized, the state government overthrown, the commonwealth reduced to

¹ Papers of the Old Congress, No. 30, Reports of the Committees on Indian Affairs, etc., II. 405-407. Here is preserved the original report, indorsed "Private report . . . passed 21 Oct. 1786—." The draft has many corrections, which are all in the handwriting of Charles Thomson, the Secretary of Congress. It is probable that the changes represent amendments made by Congress during the consideration of the report. At any rate, they show the extreme caution with which the question was handled and the fear of disclosing, even in a secret report, the share of the Massachusetts politicians in the intrigue. The report as corrected and passed was copied by Thomson into the MS. Domestic Secret Journal, 227-229. It was not entered at all in the public journal. It is printed in *Secret Journals of Congress*, I. (Domestic Affairs), 268-270.

² The report as originally submitted told whence this information came. The passage read, "and the additional information derived from the hon^{ble} Delegates from the State of Massachusetts Bay". Evidently the honorable delegates did not wish to go on record, but they must do so now.

³ The unrevised report added, "such Aid is earnestly desired by the Governor and Council, tho' particular circumstances prevent its being applied for in a more formal manner".

anarchy, and the United States involved in civil war. In view of these things, the committee declared that Congress was "bound by the Confederation,"¹ by ties of friendship, and by good policy to make such arrangements as would enable it, if required, to assist the government of Massachusetts. In addition, the magazine at Springfield must be protected. It therefore followed, the report continued, that troops must be raised; but it also followed that the insurrection must not be mentioned as a reason for raising them. Fortunately, other matters in the hands of the committee furnished sufficient ground for ordering an increase of the army. Such action had therefore been advised in the report on the western country. In conclusion, it was pointed out that, since New England would furnish most of the troops, they could serve the desired purpose there before they were marched to the frontier.

Congress might call recruits, but would they come without some guarantee of pay and sustenance? To face this question was the cheerless task of the Board of Treasury. On the same day this Board recommended that a requisition for 530,000 dollars in specie be laid in due quotas on the states of the Union. On the credit of this requisition a loan of 500,000 dollars, bearing interest at six *per cent.*, might at once be opened. Congress unanimously adopted these proposals.² Finally, a curious resolution was passed to stimulate subscriptions to the loan. In obscure and involved phrases it warned the wealthy men of New England to contribute generously, unless they wished to see the new recruits mutiny for lack of pay and go over to the insurgents.³

It has always been assumed that the reports of danger on the frontier were simply used as a blind by the committee on Indian affairs. The truth is, on the contrary, that those reports were perfectly genuine and quite grave enough to call for active measures of defence. Ever since the conclusion of peace with Great Britain the United States had been drifting towards a serious Indian war. The greatest danger arose in the Northwest, and the policies of both the English and the Americans tended to increase it. The Indians, though justly angry with Great Britain for surrendering their country in the treaty of peace, realized that they must defend that country against the power to which it was surrendered. In

¹ Cf. the third of the Articles of Confederation.

² *Journals of Congress*, XI. 188.

³ The resolution is added to the report of October 21 in the MS. Reports of the Committees on Indian Affairs and the *Secret Journals*. It might seem curious that an appeal to constituents should be entered in the secret journal, but of course it was intended for only a few constituents of a special class. These could be easily reached by confidential letters.

the refusal of the British to give up the western posts they found powerful moral support. Moreover, British agents travelled among the tribes, were present at their councils, urged them not to part with their lands, gave them supplies, including arms and ammunition—in fact, furnished every encouragement short of a definite promise of alliance. Officially, it is true, the British government and its higher representatives in America advised the Indians not to attack the United States. Practically, they fostered among the savages a hatred of the Americans which could hardly fail to lead to war.

The United States, on the other hand, pursued a course which the Indians regarded as most unjust. The first mistake was the attempt to conclude treaties with separate groups of tribes. To the rest this seemed merely a device to conquer in detail. In the next place, the Indians were required to acknowledge the territorial sovereignty of the United States according to the terms of the treaty with Great Britain. Such acknowledgment was extorted from the Wyandots, Delawares, Chippewas, and Ottawas at Fort McIntosh on January 21, 1785, and from the Shawnees at Fort Finney on January 31, 1786. The chief result of this acknowledgment was to accentuate the hostility of both the tribes which made it and those which refused to treat. In the third place, the Americans were steadily encroaching, without a shadow of right, in the Indians' opinion, on the country northwest of the Ohio river. By a treaty of October 22, 1784, the Iroquois gave up their western claims, and the Indians beyond the Ohio felt that they had been a second time betrayed. By the treaties at Fort McIntosh and Fort Finney large tracts of land nominally passed into the exclusive control of the United States. It soon became clear, however, that not even the tribes which made these treaties intended that they should be carried out. None the less, the cessions of their western claims by several states to the national government, the land ordinance of 1785, the appointment of a geographer and surveyors, the beginning of surveys in the Seven Ranges, and the efforts to devise a government for the western country all showed that Congress would soon open the Ohio lands to settlement. But hardest of all for the Indians to bear was the unlawful intrusion of the frontiersman, with his fundamental tenet that the red man has no rights which the white man is bound to respect. This intrusion, though forbidden by proclamations of Congress, was so continuous and extensive that it produced a chronic state of guerrilla warfare along the Ohio valley. Early in 1785 Congress ordered Lieutenant-Colonel Harmar, the commanding officer on the frontier, to drive out all settlers north of the

Ohio, and during that year and the next Harmar expelled as many as he could, but the tide of immigration was by no means stopped.¹

For all these reasons no moment of the year 1786 was free from danger of a general Indian war. The commissioners who treated with the Shawnees in January reported the hostile feeling and continued depredations of the other western tribes.² Various army officers on the frontier confirmed their view.³ The Kentucky "long knives" regarded the situation apparently with more pleasure than alarm, and bombarded Governor Henry of Virginia with requests for permission to make the first attack.⁴ In response the state government authorized the field officers of Kentucky to "concert some system for their own defence," and requested Congress to assist in protecting the Kentucky border.⁵

Congress directed Butler and Parsons, the Commissioners of Indian Affairs, to report whether the settlers in Kentucky were really in danger. The reply of the commissioners, read in Congress on June 21, stated that distinct hostility, with active encouragement from the British, was the fixed attitude of the tribes beyond the Ohio. The only way to bring them to terms would be to march a strong body of troops into their country, overawe them with this show of force, expel the British agents, and then make a comprehensive treaty. Especially it was urged that an expedition should be sent to break up a marauding band of Cherokees and other Indians, which at that moment was the most serious menace to the people of Kentucky.⁶ Now to carry out such a policy would of course require

¹ Justin Winsor, *The Westward Movement*, Chapter XIII.; Theodore Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West*, III, Chapter II.; C. C. Royce, "Cessions of Land by Indian Tribes to the United States", *First Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, 249-262, and "Indian Land Cessions to the United States", *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, Part II., 648-651. Further valuable information on Indian affairs is found in the report, dated February 1, 1786, of Richard Butler and Samuel Holden Parsons, who made the treaty with the Shawnees. The feeling of the frontier settlers towards the Indians is illustrated by the statement that the Kentuckians could hardly be restrained from attacking the Indians who were negotiating the treaty (*Papers of the Old Congress*, No. 56, Indian Affairs, 377-384). In the same volume (pages 341-407) are numerous papers concerning the visit to Congress in the spring of 1786 of the Seneca chief best known as "Cornplanter". These throw much light on the situation in the Indian country.

² *Papers of the Old Congress*, No. 56, 377-384.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 150, I, 137-155, 293-294.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 56, 213, 268-269, 271-273.

⁵ Resolves of the Virginia Council and letter of Governor Henry, Richmond, May 15-16, 1786 (*ibid.*, No. 150, II, 37-38).

⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 56, 283-285. The report was based on reliable statements from agents who had been sent out in a vain effort to gather the western tribes for a general treaty.

the raising of more troops. General Knox brought this point out clearly by reporting, on the same day, that the force then in the federal service was entirely insufficient to defend the whole Kentucky frontier. If war should break out, at least fifteen hundred men would be required. As an immediate measure he recommended that two companies should be sent to the falls of the Ohio.¹ On the next day Congress voted to send two companies to that point,² and soon afterwards instructed Knox to report on the expense of increasing the army as he had suggested.³

At this point, for a time, the movement towards strengthening the federal army paused. The summer passed without bringing much disquieting news from the frontier. There was a moment of peril when in June the Six Nations and certain western Indians met in council near Niagara. Joseph Brant, who had recently returned from England, tried to unite the tribes there represented against the United States, but was obliged to confess that the British government would promise no active help. The Shawnees, who came intent on hostilities, received no encouragement from the Iroquois, and the danger of war seemed for the moment to have passed.⁴

In reality, however, at this very time the war clouds were rapidly gathering in two distinct localities—Vincennes and the Shawnee towns along the Scioto and Miami rivers. At Vincennes the French inhabitants greatly outnumbered and cordially hated the Americans. The Indians, who complained of perfidious and brutal treatment from the Americans, sided entirely with the French. Threats and minor collisions finally produced a reign of terror, during which the Americans appealed to George Rogers Clark for help. Seizing this welcome opportunity, the Kentuckians on August 2 decided to send a strong expedition under Clark against the Indians. Nearly half of the Kentucky militia was called out, and it was expected that about the middle of September twelve hundred men or more would march from the falls of the Ohio. This was war, and it might be difficult for Congress to take no part.⁵ On the other hand, the

¹ Papers of the Old Congress, No. 151, 187-189.

² Journals of Congress, XI, 86-87.

³ Indorsement in Charles Thomson's hand on the report of General Knox dated June 19 and read on June 21, 1786.

⁴ "Cornplanter" was present at this council, labored for peace, and came to Pittsburg with a full report, which was forwarded to Congress (Col. William Butler to Gen. Richard Butler, Pittsburg, September 11, 1786, Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II, 1-13). Cf. Winsor, *The Westward Movement*, 273-274.

⁵ Major William North to Knox, "Camp Rapids of the Ohio," August 23, 1786, and Muskingum, September 15, 1786 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II, 21-23, 25-26, 33-35). In his second report North enclosed a long letter from J. M. P. Legrace to General Clark, dated Post St. Vincent, July 22, 1786, and

Shawnee warriors returned from Niagara disappointed at the submissive temper of the Iroquois, but none the less determined upon war. They summoned the braves of the surrounding tribes to council at their towns. Several hundred warriors assembled—some estimates put the number as high as two thousand—and during July and August, while the war dance was in progress at the towns, small parties were raiding the settlements south of the Ohio and coming back with prisoners and scalps. Finally, at Lower Sandusky early in September several tribes made an offensive alliance against the United States. It was given out that upon Hutchins and his surveyors would fall the first blow in a great struggle for the boundary of the Ohio.¹

Now to understand the attitude of Congress on the Indian question, one must ask just what news it had received by the twentieth of October. It is the failure to make this enquiry that has so long involved the subject in confusion. In 1786 news travelled slowly from the Ohio to New York. Major William North, inspector of the federal troops, who in the summer made a trip down the Ohio river, sent to General Knox, in letters of August 23 and September 15, the first explicit information about both Clark's intended expedition and the threatened Indian attack. He declared that "the greatest part of those tribes who treated with us are inclined for war and the British agents and traders are doing everything in their power to set them upon us. The Wabash indians are inimical as in fact are all the tribes who have any connexion with the British."² It was not till October 16 that these letters, with depositions and other accompanying papers, were submitted for the information of Congress.³ On the nineteenth Knox sent in further papers of a similar tenor from Lieutenant-Colonel Harmar. Taken together, these communications contained practically everything concerning Indian affairs which appeared in the committee report of October 20.

From all these things several conclusions may be drawn. First, the statements of the committee, far from being fabricated, were amply supported by information from responsible officers on the frontier. When these officers wrote they could not possibly have

setting forth the French view of the situation there (*ibid.*, 41-62). North also sent the resolves of the Kentucky officers on August 2 (*ibid.*, 38-40). Cf. Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West*, III, 78-83.

¹ Letters of North, cited above, with enclosures from persons who had recently been at the Shawnee towns; Harmar to Knox, September 17 and October 10, with similar enclosures (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II, 75-80, 91-101).

² North's letter of August 23, cited above.

³ Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II, 63.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 83.

foreseen any connection between their reports and civil commotions in Massachusetts. Second, if there had been no commotions whatever in Massachusetts, the danger in the West would have fully justified an increase in the federal army. Third, the news of this danger reached Congress just in time to serve conveniently as the sole reason publicly assigned for ordering the new enlistments. General Knox, who was accustomed to write very frankly to Washington, sent the latter on October 23 an account which may be accepted as stating the facts just as Knox saw them. "The Indians on our frontiers," he said, "are giving indisputable evidence of their hostile intentions. Congress anxiously desirous of meeting the evils on the frontiers have unanimously agreed to augment the troops now in service. . . . This measure is important and will tend to strengthen the principles of government if necessary as well as to defend the frontiers. I mention the idea of strengthening government as confidential. But the state of Massachusetts requires the greatest assistance and Congress are fully impressed with the importance of supporting her with great exertions."¹ It may be added that the present writer is in no wise trying to prove that the Indian question alone would have roused Congress to action. Probably nothing short of open Indian war could have effected that. But that question did supply a real, though less powerful, motive, in addition to the one arising from the Shays Rebellion.

We now come to the questions which have been, perhaps, the most obscure of all—how were the troops actually raised, what use was made of them, and what was the attitude of the Massachusetts legislature in regard to the federal intervention. On October 22 Knox notified Governor Bowdoin of the quota required of Massachusetts. He enlarged upon the Indian war and was discreetly silent about the insurrection.² The same line of argument was followed by the governor, when five days later he laid the matter before the General Court. "It is of great importance," he said, "that the United States should be prepared against so formidable a combination."³ On the next day a bill passed both houses for the immediate raising of the troops.⁴ Those concerned in the plot to conceal the more important reason for the enlistments made studied efforts to keep up appearances. Governor Bowdoin in a later message declared that the news from the West was still more alarming, and that

¹ Knox MSS., XIX, 33.

² *Ibid.*, 29.

³ *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts, 1786-87*, 948-949.

⁴ Massachusetts Archives, Court Records, XLVII, 200-203.

the surveyors had fled to the Ohio and cast up intrenchments.¹ King sent to Gerry from New York a gloomy forecast of "a very dangerous and extensive Indian War." The quota asked of Massachusetts did seem large, he said, but on a former occasion, when that state had been drawn on for less than her share, her government had promised to make up the difference, whenever required to do so.² Gerry's reply, however, showed that the secret was out. "Some of the country members laugh," he said, "and say the Indian War is only a political one to obtain a standing army."³ Major William North added with brutal frankness, "The people here smell a rat, that the Troops about to be raised are more for the Insurgents than the Indians."⁴ Colonel James Swan wrote to Knox on October 26, "Being in Town at Concert, I am agreeably saluted with the news of War being declared against the Indians. I hope in this declaration 'Indians,'—is meant all who oppose the Dignity, honour, and happiness of the United States, or of either of the States."⁵

Major-General Henry Jackson of the Massachusetts militia was appointed Lieutenant-Colonel to raise and command the state's contingent of the federal troops.⁶ He entered upon his duties with great zeal, but his task was that of making bricks without straw. No state except Virginia took any step towards paying the money requisition of October 21.⁷ The loan opened by the Board of Treasury was consequently an utter failure. The Massachusetts legislature naturally enough felt that it could grant no money save for the immediate recruiting service. For this an appropriation of twenty-five hundred pounds was made,⁸ but the loan which was opened as the only means of obtaining this money excited little enthusiasm among the wealthy men of Boston. "I have no Money as yet to commence recruiting," wrote Jackson on November 19, "and

¹ *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts, 1786-87*, 954-956 (Message of November 13).

² *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, I, 191-192.

³ *Ibid.*, 193.

⁴ Knox MSS., XIX, 36 (North to Knox, October 29, 1786). North had come to Boston with Knox's recommendation for a commission, which he received, as a major in the Massachusetts contingent.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 35.

⁶ Jackson's commission, dated April 2, 1787, and signed by St. Clair and Knox, is in the Boston Public Library.

⁷ *The Papers of James Madison*, II, 581. Virginia laid an additional export duty of six shillings per hogshead on tobacco to meet the requisition; Henning, *Statutes at Large . . . of Virginia*, XII, 288.

⁸ *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts, 1786-87*, 374-376. One member remarked that it was unnecessary to pay the soldiers, for they would all get rich western lands (North to Knox, October 29, Knox MSS., XIX, 36).

I know not when I shall."¹ Christopher Gore in a letter to King burst out with the wish that "it was generally believed that an attack on property and a subversion of the Government was intended, for so great a languor, so little spirit I never knew. £500 only," he continued, "have yet been subscribed . . . though it is generally thought that those troops are to be raised to support the authority in Mass. . . . Is not this dreadful?"² Knox, who had predicted a hearty response to a loan, was keenly disappointed by these lean results.³ The explanation is, apparently, that the government party in Massachusetts was now growing tired of temporizing with the insurgents, and was almost ready for a forcible exertion of the authority of the commonwealth. With this change of feeling, the artifice of raising federal troops lost much of the support which it had at first commanded.⁴

The requisition and the loans might languish, but contracts must meantime be let for the support, and, if possible, the payment of the troops. Knox and the Board of Treasury besought Robert Morris and Jeremiah Wadsworth to take up this task, but these gentlemen did not display unseemly eagerness. "Although," wrote Knox, "I found that they possessed the best disposition to render every reasonable service to their Country, yet at the same time it was in no degree their desire to undertake any public operations whatever." Morris finally agreed in general terms to enter upon the business, and this enabled Knox to drag in the unwilling Wadsworth. The latter complained, "where the Money is to come from Heaven knows," but Knox replied, "For Gods sake do not delay a single moment longer than is indispensably necessary." Delays did continue, however, and, after the recruiting had begun, it looked at times as if the men would freeze and starve. It is hard to see how Jackson could have made any progress with his enlistments, had not Stephen Bruce promptly advanced such supplies, except uniforms, as he required. In Connecticut recruits came into Hartford in the dead of winter without the slightest provision for their support. With much grumbling Wadsworth gave them food, fuel, and shelter, "but," he wrote to Knox, "the Treasury Board must . . . refund my present advances—or I shall immediately Stop." Finally, in February, the lack of response to either the requisition or the loan caused Morris and Wadsworth to throw up the whole negotiation with the govern-

¹ Knox MSS., XIX, 53.

² *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, I, 196.

³ Knox MSS., XIX, 20, 75.

⁴ The loss of interest is mentioned with regret by Stephen Higginson in a letter to Knox of November 25, 1786; *Report of the American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 743-745.

ment. No regular contracts were entered into for the subsistence of the recruits.¹

All these difficulties delayed the recruiting till it seemed likely to become a jest. "The Deacons of Massachusetts," wrote Wadsworth to Knox on December 11, "hant raised a man yet as I am told and believe—what do you think of them—Shays has 7 or 800 in arms. Had you not better employ them than Wait for the Deacons. I begin to think he will govern the State, as I see no disposition in any body else to do it."² In reality Jackson, trusting to money pledged though not yet paid, had just begun enlisting men. He had enrolled seventy at the end of the month and twice as many before the last of January. On February 18 he reported one hundred and ninety recruits. It was slow work, however, and the total number enlisted in the state was not quite half of the allotted quota. A large number of the men, probably two-thirds or more, were Revolutionary veterans.³ There was also difficulty in securing officers. The twenty Revolutionary captains who were offered commissions remembered how they had formerly been paid, and only three of them accepted. It was the middle of January before the list was complete.⁴ For reasons easy to surmise, instead of attempting to draw arms and accoutrements from Springfield, Knox sent these supplies, by sea no doubt, from Philadelphia.⁵

To complete Jackson's discomfiture, the not too buoyant sails of his enterprise were almost completely blanketed by General Lincoln's expedition. The federal officers must have felt envious at the promptness with which thousands of militia responded and thousands of pounds were subscribed to prosecute this campaign. Jackson at first hoped that Lincoln's war-chest might overflow to the benefit of the recruiting service, but there is no indication that it did.⁶ The crisis of the rebellion brought forward again the question of guarding and using the Continental stores at Springfield. In December

¹ Correspondence of Knox, Morris, Wadsworth, Bruce, Jackson, and the Board of Treasury, November 22, 1786—February 11, 1787 (Knox MSS., XIX, 28, 56, 62, 67, 70, 76, 78, 85, 87, 89, 92, 105, 121, 161, 163; Knox to Congress, February 12 and May 2, 1787 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II, 243-245, 327-329). Jackson paid Bruce as far as he could from the money subscribed in Massachusetts.

² Knox MSS., XIX, 85.

³ Jackson to Knox, December 11 and 31, 1786, January 28 and February 18, 1787 (*ibid.*, 84, 111, 141, 170); Knox to Congress, May 2, 1787 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II, 327-329).

⁴ Jackson to Knox, November 19, 1786, and January 17, 1787 (Knox MSS., XIX, 53, 120). Most of the appointments were made on the recommendation of Knox or Jackson.

⁵ Knox to Jackson, December 3, 1786 (*ibid.*, 75); Jackson to Knox, December 11 (*ibid.*, 84).

⁶ Jackson to Knox, January 10, 1787 (*ibid.*, 124).

General Shepard asked for permission to arm the Hampshire militia from the magazine. Knox, in spite of his ardent devotion to the government cause in Massachusetts, never dared to use national troops or property for other than strictly national purposes. He therefore informed Shepard that without a vote of Congress—and Congress could not find a quorum—he could not grant this permission.¹ In January, however, the insurgents once more threatened the arsenal. Shepard, who had been stationed at Springfield with a thousand men, deemed national interests sufficiently involved, and on the nineteenth wrote to Knox that he was about to draw supplies from the magazine. He took some five hundred small-arms, three field-pieces, a howitzer, the necessary ammunition, and some accoutrements for horsemen. He was probably relieved when word at last arrived from Knox that his action was approved. Shepard soon found himself besieged by a greatly superior force of insurgents. All approach to Springfield except from the south was cut off. Shays knew that his one hope was to scatter Shepard's force and seize the arsenal before Lincoln's arrival. On January 25 took place the famous attack and repulse. It was the federal artillery which turned the insurgent column to flight. A few days later General Lincoln dispersed the entire force under Shays, and the backbone of the rebellion was broken. The Hampshire militia continued for a time to guard the arsenal.²

From all these stirring scenes the federal recruits were conspicuously absent. Jackson had proposed to offer their services to General Lincoln, but was overruled by Knox. The truth is that Knox was disgusted at the failure of the state government to give financial support to the recruiting, and that government was equally dissatisfied with the inactivity of the recruits. Jackson was entirely right when he said that it was hopeless to expect help from the wealthy men, unless his command should do something which would at least appear to be of advantage to the state. His businesslike plan was that his force should be assigned without restrictions to the service of the commonwealth, provided the latter would assume the entire expense. This would save the state an equal expenditure on the militia, would give it credit to the same extent on its federal account, and would insure the speedy completion of the quota. The two governments would thus be working in harmony and no longer

¹ Knox MSS., XIX., 95, 103.

² Shepard to Knox, January 19 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II. 1731); Knox to Shepard, January 21 (Knox MSS., XIX. 133); John Bryant to Knox, January 23 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II. 177-178); Shepard to Bowdoin, January 26 (Massachusetts Archives, CXC. 317-318); Abel Whitney to Knox, February 2 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II. 211-217).

at cross-purposes. Unfortunately, this sensible advice made no impression upon Knox.¹

From the side of the state the first official protest was heard on February 5. The Senate passed a resolution, introduced, it is said, by Samuel Adams, requesting the governor to inform Congress that a rebellion existed, that the government, supported by the great majority of the people, was successfully suppressing it, but that, should any emergency arise, the state would count upon "such support from the United States as is expressly and solemnly stipulated by the Articles of Confederation." In the House the friends of the insurgents were by this time quite discredited and overridden. On this question, however, they were probably reinforced by members who, without favoring rebellion, disliked federal interference. At any rate, the resolution was recast by the House, though with what changes the records do not show. The Senate refused to concur and conferees were appointed. Then the Senate voted to add an amendment, requesting the governor to ask Congress to take its own measures for protecting its property at Springfield, "in order that the troops of this state now stationed there, may be employed on other service." On the seventh the House was whipped into line and accepted the Senate measure, amendment and all. Harmony thus seemed to be restored, but, for some reason, perhaps an informality in procedure, the Senate recalled the resolution, even after voting to send it to the governor, and passed it once more without alteration on the ninth. The House, meantime, had experienced another change of heart, and now voted the measure down. Again conferees were appointed, and then, on the same afternoon, the resolve once more passed the Senate, seemingly as new business, was sent down, and was promptly accepted by the House. To add a final touch of mystery to the affair, the resolution which at last prevailed has completely disappeared. It is known, however, that Governor Bowdoin wrote to Congress as the General Court desired, and that he added the request about the arsenal.²

¹ Jackson to Knox, December 31, January 21, February 11 and 18 (Knox MSS., XIX, 111, 132, 163, 170). Jackson pointed out that the decision of the state government early in February to raise a force of militia not to exceed 1500 men for four months was a menace to his recruiting, since the state offered a larger bounty than he did.

² The resolution which was finally passed does not appear in the Court Records or in the *Acts and Resolves*, and a diligent search in the files of the Massachusetts Archives has failed to unearth it. Its passage, however, is clearly recorded in the MS. Journal of the Senate, VII, 344, and the MS. Journal of the House of Representatives, VII, 397. It is also distinctly mentioned in the governor's message of March 2 (*Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts, 1786-87, 974-975*). The controversy between the houses can be traced in the Journal of the Senate, VII, 325-344; and

Before the General Court had discovered its own mind, the strenuous proceedings in Hampshire County had already convinced Knox that the federal troops should be at Springfield. On February 9 he ordered both Jackson and Lieutenant-Colonel David Humphreys of the Connecticut contingent to march their commands thither. He warned them, however, to engage in no service except that of protecting the arsenal. Jackson, moreover, was to march only in case he should receive from the state government the means to pay his officers and support his men. Knox wrote to Lincoln on the same day that, while he expected that Humphreys would proceed to Springfield, he did not anticipate that Jackson would. His forecast was entirely accurate. Jackson received no supplies, and his orders, conditional though they had been, were promptly countermanded. Humphreys with one hundred and twenty men reached Springfield on February 24, and relieved the militia at the arsenal. This—unless the loan of arms is counted—was the nearest approach of the national government to armed intervention in the Shays Rebellion.¹

The countermanding of Jackson's orders may have had some influence on the Massachusetts legislature. It was followed up by a message from the governor, recalling to mind the long-neglected money requisition.² Then, on February 19, Congress took up the question of the enlistments, and, but for the determined opposition of the members from Massachusetts, would have voted to stop them then and there.³ Finally, on March 2, Governor Bowdoin informed the legislature that he had word from Knox that the Massachusetts recruits would march to Springfield as soon as the state should enable them to do so and not before. Thereupon the General Court at last responded. On March 7 an appropriation not to exceed five thousand pounds was voted "for the pay, cloathing and subsistence" of the federal troops.⁴ As an equivalent for this grant, the help of the United States forces was requested in the pursuit of insurgents beyond the borders of the state. Finally, a federal

the *Journal of the House*, VII. 380-397. In the Massachusetts Archives, CX.C. 350-353, are also attested drafts giving nearly all the stages in the proceedings except the last. See also W. V. Wells, *The Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams*, III. 241-242. Last of all, a month later, the delegates in Congress took their turn in notifying that body concerning the rebellion. See below, p. 64, note 3.

¹ Knox to Jackson, February 9 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II. 239-241); to Lincoln, February 9 (Knox MSS., XIX. 160); to Congress, February 12 and March 13 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II. 243-245; No. 151, 243-254).

² February 14, 1787; *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts, 1786-87*, 970-972.

³ *Journals of Congress*, XII. 11-12; *The Papers of James Madison*, II. 581-587.

⁴ *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts, 1786-87*, 499.

commission was requested for General Lincoln, with authority to march the state militia to any place in the United States for the capture of insurgent refugees.¹ Congress paid no attention to these requests. Its only wish now was as soon as possible to abandon the enlistments. Its steps in this direction, which have never been correctly traced, must therefore be next considered.

Charles Pinckney moved in Congress, probably about the middle of February, that the enlistments be suspended until further directions should be given. On the nineteenth a committee to which his motion had been referred reported against it. In reply Pinckney contended that the rebellion in Massachusetts had been crushed, and that there was no money with which to pay and support the new recruits. A slight increase of the force stationed on the Ohio was the most he was willing to concede. King was on his feet as Pinckney sat down, with a "moving appeal" that the recruiting should go on. His chief argument was that, though the insurrection seemed to be quelled, the state would probably proceed not only to punish the chief offenders, but also to disarm and disfranchise the whole body of their followers. The success of this policy, he thought, was doubtful. A new crisis might result. To withdraw the support of Congress at this moment would look like disapproval, and might kindle the revolt afresh. Pinckney replied bluntly that he thought Congress ought to disapprove such measures as Massachusetts seemed likely to adopt; a state following such a course should be left to suffer the consequences. Then Madison, rising as mediator, contributed some remarkable observations. He first discussed the constitutionality of interference by Congress in the internal controversies of a state. It was a bit difficult, he admitted, to reconcile such a course with the Articles of Confederation. Those articles gave Congress only express powers, and this was not among them. Still, there was one circumstance which might justify such action. He referred to the danger of intervention by a foreign power. Now in this case direct evidence of such danger might be lacking; "yet there was sufficient ground for a general suspicion of readiness in Great Britain to take advantage of events in this country to warrant precautions against her." Such was the argument of the future author of the Virginia Resolutions. Coming to the question of stopping the enlistments, Madison seems almost to have used King's reasoning in support of Pinckney's conclusion. There might still be trouble, he said, in Massachusetts. The opinion of her delegates should have great weight. Every state might ask similar consideration in the future. In fact, this reflection had produced the enthu-

¹ *Ibid.*, 496-499.

siasm with which Virginia had voted a tax on tobacco to pay the requisition. As a compromise, he advised that the enlistments be not flatly countermanded, but suspended for a time, with rather indefinite instructions. On the division five states supported Pinckney's motion and three opposed it. Virginia was divided. The motion was therefore lost, but the vote showed that the enlistments had almost no support further south than New York.¹

On March 8 Grayson of Virginia moved that the stores at Springfield be transferred to some place of greater safety. Five days later Knox reported adversely upon this motion. Massachusetts, he said, had proved her ability to put down the rebellion and to defend the arsenal. Humphreys was now at Springfield with a sufficient guard. There was therefore no occasion to remove the stores. To do so, moreover, might hurt the reputation of the state government. He showed that Springfield was for various reasons an excellent place of deposit and as safe as any he could mention. Grayson's suggestion was accordingly dropped.²

On March 28 Congress appointed a committee "to consider the military establishment, and particularly to report a proper resolution for stopping the enlistments."³ This committee recommended on April 4 the repeal of the resolutions of October 20, the retention of the troops so far enlisted, and the discharge with pay of all officers appointed but no longer required.⁴ Even this moderate measure, which would have increased the army by about five hundred men, was more than Congress would adopt. As amended and passed on the ninth, the resolutions provided that from the troops raised in Massachusetts two artillery companies should be organized and stationed at Springfield. All other officers and men enrolled under the resolves of October 20 should be paid and discharged. This con-

¹ *Journals of Congress*, XII, 11-12; *The Papers of James Madison*, II, 581-587.

² Grayson's motion was not entered in the journal of Congress, but a memorandum of it is inserted between pages 242 and 243 of the Papers of the Old Congress, No. 151. Knox's report is in the same volume, 243-254. See also *The Papers of James Madison*, II, 590.

³ *Ibid.*, 598. Madison states that King had reminded Congress of the previous motion for discontinuing the enlistments, "and intimated that the state of things in Massachusetts was at present such that no opposition would now be made by the delegates of that State." This is hard to reconcile with the later opposition which those delegates did make. It may be, however, that they were ready for the stopping of enlistments, but not for the partial disbandment finally voted.

It may be added that on March 9 the Massachusetts delegates had, as instructed, laid before Congress a long account of the rebellion and the steps taken to suppress it. They expressed their assurance that, had need arisen, Congress would have given the effective help required by the Articles of Confederation (*Journals of Congress*, XII, 15-22).

⁴ Papers of the Old Congress, No. 30, Reports on Indian Affairs, 409-412.

clusion was reached by a vote of seven states against two. Massachusetts and Rhode Island voted "no"; New York was divided.¹ "I have entertained many doubts," wrote King to Gerry, "relative to the policy of this measure considering the situation of Massachusetts and the condition of the confederacy. Our State voted agt. the measure, but we were almost singular."²

The "condition of the confederacy" might well lead members to oppose the resolutions. Crises like the Shays Rebellion might occur in other states than Massachusetts, and men might again look to the federal army as a possible bulwark against anarchy. But the history of the recent enlistments proved that with such questions the existing federal government had neither the power nor the capacity to deal. The trouble was not that Congress had been indifferent. On the contrary, Congress had seen the danger clearly and had striven to meet it. But it could find no adequate material resources, and its secret method prevented it from exerting any moral influence. Shays and Lincoln went their ways without the least regard for Congress and its recruits. Rebellion completed the proof that a real national government must be established. It was reserved for the Whisky Insurrection of 1794 to show how a real national government would treat rebellion. So low, moreover, had the prestige of Congress sunk, that in abandoning the enlistments it seemed to be letting slip almost its last hold on actual power. William Pynchon wrote in his journal on April 19: "News that the Federal troops are discharged; that this is one of the last struggles of Congress. All grow uneasy, disaffected."³ Unless some new cement could be found, would not the rope of sand fall utterly to pieces?

There had been raised in all about three hundred recruits in Massachusetts and one hundred and fifty in Connecticut. Virginia had completed her cavalry troop of sixty men. New Hampshire and Rhode Island had voted to raise their quotas and had appointed officers, but no money was appropriated, and nothing further was done. Maryland made no response whatever. The two Massachusetts companies of artillery, numbering seventy-three men each, were marched to Springfield during May and June. One of them was soon afterwards ordered to West Point. All the other recruits

¹ *Journals of Congress*, XII, 28-29. The money requisition of October 21, 1786, was repealed on May 3. Provision was made for crediting the states on their federal accounts for all expenses which they had incurred (*ibid.*, 41).

² *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, I, 218. King mentions to Gerry another motive for his opposition. "I am extremely mortified", he says, "with the Disappointments which this arrangement will produce with the worthy Gentlemen who have laid aside other concerns and engaged as Officers in this corps".

³ *Journal of William Pynchon*, 275-276.

were quickly disbanded. They were paid off with orders on the receivers of Continental taxes.¹

One question remains to be answered. What of the Indian hostilities? Why was there no appeal to them—so far as is recorded—as a reason for continuing the enlistments? This question has always been ignored, no doubt because of the assumption that, from the first, Congress had not taken the Indian question seriously. The real explanation, while not quite so easy as this, is still not difficult to find. It is simply that the Indian troubles had ceased for a time to be an insistent issue. George Rogers Clark's expedition to Vincennes in September, 1786, drew off the attention of the Shawnees and their allies from their intended attack on the surveyors and the settlements near the Ohio. Clark's raid has generally been called a failure, because many of his men mutinied, and he struck no decisive blow. It seems clear, however, that he contributed much, at a critical moment, towards averting an Indian war.² Equally important, perhaps, was an attack upon the Shawnees made in October by several hundred Kentucky militia under Colonel Benjamin Logan. The Indian warriors had gone to meet Clark. Logan therefore swept through the country almost unopposed, burned seven of the Shawnee villages and all of their corn, took scalps and prisoners, and seems quite to have broken the spirit of the tribe.³ As a result of these expeditions⁴ and of disagreements among the tribes,⁵ the Indians made no concerted attack that year. In December Brant gathered a great council of the Iroquois and the western tribes near the mouth of the Detroit river. He labored to carry in this assembly a declaration of war against the Americans. Failing in this, he secured a united demand for peace, on the terms of the Ohio boundary and a common treaty between the whole Indian confederacy

¹ Reports of Knox to Congress, May 2, July 14, September 26, 1787 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II. 321-324, 327-329, 413-414). Virginia, Connecticut, and Rhode Island voted their quotas in October, 1786; New Hampshire on December 26. Hening, *Statutes . . . of Virginia*, XII. 255; *At the General Assembly . . . of . . . Rhode Island . . . begun on the last Monday in October*, etc., Providence, printed by John Carter, pp. 7-8; A. S. Batchellor, editor, *Early State Papers of New Hampshire*, XX. 723, 760; Humphreys to Washington, November 1, 1786, in Sparks, *Correspondence of the Revolution*, IV. 147-149.

² Harmar to Knox, November 15, 1786; Richard Butler (Superintendent of Indian Affairs) to Knox, December 13, 1786 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II. 115-118, 163-166); Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West*, III. 83-84; Winsor, *The Westward Movement*, 275, 345.

³ Harmar's letter of November 15 gives a good account of Logan's raid.

⁴ Butler to Knox, January 3, 1787 (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II. 257-258).

⁵ Butler and Harmar both wrote that the Wyandots and Delawares opposed the warlike counsels of the Shawnees.

and the United States.¹ The message from this council to Congress was a high-spirited manifesto backed by great power. Nevertheless, it made possible for a time the substitution of diplomacy for war, and it was during the breathing space thus gained that the question of terminating the enlistments came up in Congress. It was true that small bands of frontiersmen and Indians continued their mutual depredations, and the Kentuckians still panted for war.² Nevertheless, General Butler could truthfully write on March 28: "Our prospects of peace with the Indian nations are much brighter than they have been, and I hope . . . they will daily increase." This letter was laid before Congress on the very day on which the disbandment was voted.³ It thus came about that both of the reasons for increasing the federal army had lost most of their original force. Congress therefore needed little persuasion to reverse its policy. To General Knox, however, it was a great sorrow to lose the troops which he had so laboriously obtained. He felt sure, as he had a year before, that not less than fifteen hundred men were constantly needed on the frontier. Still, he admitted that the government had no resources with which to maintain so large a force.⁴

JOSEPH PARKER WARREN.

¹ "Extracts from the indian speeches at the Western council" (Papers of the Old Congress, No. 150, II. 267-277); Butler to Knox, March 28, 1787 (*ibid.*, 287-298); letter from the Indian council at the mouth of the Detroit river to Congress (*ibid.*, 381-387).

² Harmar to Knox, May 14; Knox to Congress, July 10; John Cleves Symmes to the President of Congress, Louisville, Kentucky, May 3, 1787 (*ibid.*, 359-365; No. 151, 259-270; No. 56, 197-200, 205-207).

³ *Ibid.*, No. 150, II. 287-299.

⁴ Knox to Congress, July 10, 1787 (*ibid.*, No. 151, 259-270).

THE NEGOTIATIONS AT GHENT IN 1814

THE government of the United States had been honestly loath to declare war in 1812, and had signalized its reluctance by immediate advances looking to a restoration of peace. These were made through Jonathan Russell, the *chargé d'affaires* in London when hostilities began. To use the expression of Monroe, then Secretary of State, "At the moment of the declaration of war, the President, regretting the necessity which produced it, looked to its termination, and provided for it."¹ The two concessions required as indispensable, in the overture thus referred to, dated June 26, 1812, were the revocation of the Orders in Council, and the abandonment of the practice of impressing from American merchant ships. Should these preliminary conditions be obtained, Russell was authorized to stipulate an armistice, during which the two countries should enter upon negotiations, to be conducted either at Washington or in London, for the settlement of all points of difference.

Russell made this communication to Castlereagh August 24, 1812. Before this date Admiral Warren had sailed from England for the American command, carrying with him the propositions of the British government for a suspension of hostilities, consequent upon the repeal of the Orders in Council. In view of Warren's mission, and of the fact that Russell had no powers to negotiate, but merely to conclude an arrangement upon terms which he could not alter, and which his government had laid down in ignorance of the revocation of the Orders, Castlereagh declined to discuss with him the American requirements. "I cannot, however," he wrote, "refrain on one single point from expressing my surprise, namely, that as a condition preliminary even to a suspension of hostilities, the Government of the United States should have thought fit to demand that the British Government should desist from its ancient and accustomed practice of impressing British seamen from the merchant ships of a foreign state, simply on the assurance that a law shall hereafter be passed to prohibit the employment of British seamen in the public or commercial service of that state."² "The Government

¹ Monroe to Russell, August 21, 1812. *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, III, 587.

² *Ibid.*, 590.

could not consent to suspend the exercise of a right upon which the naval strength of the empire mainly depends," until fully convinced that the object would be assured by other means. To a subsequent modification of the American propositions, in form, though not in tenor, the British minister replied in the same spirit, throwing the weight of his objections upon the question of impressment, which indeed remained alone of the two causes of rupture.¹

Commendable as was its desire for peace, the American government had made the mistake of being unwilling to insure it by due and timely preparation for war. In these advances, therefore, its adversary naturally saw not magnanimity, but apprehension. Russell, in reporting his final interview, wrote, "Lord Castlereagh once observed somewhat loftily, that if the American Government was so anxious to get rid of the war,² it would have an opportunity of doing so on learning the revocation of the Orders in Council." The American representative rejoined with proper spirit; but the remark betrayed the impression produced by this speedy offer, joined to the notorious military unreadiness of the United States. Such things do not make for peace. The British ministry, like a large part of the American people, saw in the declaration of war a mere variation upon the intermittent policy of commercial restrictions of the past five years; an attempt to frighten by bluster. In such spirit Monroe, in this very letter of June 26 to Russell, had dwelt upon the many advantages to be derived from peace with the United States, adding, "not to mention the injuries which cannot fail to result from a prosecution of the war." In transcribing his instructions, Russell discreetly omitted the latter phase; but the omission, like the words themselves, betrays consciousness that the administration was faithful to the tradition of its party, dealing in threats rather than in deeds. Through great part of the final negotiations the impression thus made remained with the British ministers.

On September 20, 1812, the chancellor of the Russian Empire requested a visit from the American minister resident at St. Petersburg, Mr. John Quincy Adams. In the consequent interview, the next evening, the chancellor said that the Czar, having recently made peace and re-established commercial intercourse with Great Britain, was much concerned that war should have arisen almost immediately between her and the United States. Hostilities between the two nations, which together nearly monopolized the carrying trade of the world, would prevent the economical benefits to Russia expected

¹ Correspondence between Russell and Castlereagh, September 12-18, 1812; and Russell to Monroe, September 17. *Ibid.*, 591-595.

² Russell's italics.

from the recent change in her political relations. The question was then asked, whether a proffer of Russian mediation would be regarded favorably by the United States. Adams had not yet received official intelligence even of the declaration of war, and was without information as to the views of his government on the point suggested; but he expressed certainty that such an advance would be cordially met, and he could foresee no obstacle to its entertainment. The proposal was accordingly made to the President, through the customary channels, and on March 11, 1813, was formally accepted by him. James A. Bayard and Albert Gallatin were nominated commissioners, conjointly with Mr. Adams, to act for the United States in forming a treaty of peace under the mediation of the Czar. They sailed soon afterwards.

The American acceptance reached St. Petersburg about June 15; but on that day Adams was informed by the chancellor that his despatches from London signified the rejection of the Russian proposition by the British government, on the ground that the differences with the United States involved principles of the internal government of Great Britain, which could not be submitted to the discussion of any mediation.¹ As the Russian court was then in campaign at the headquarters of the allied armies, in the tremendous operations of the summer of 1813 against Napoleon, much delay necessarily ensued. On September 1, however, the British ambassador, who was accompanying the court in the field, presented a formal letter reaffirming the unwillingness of his government to treat under mediation, but offering through the Czar, whose mediatorial advance was so far recognized, to nominate plenipotentiaries to meet those of the United States in direct consultation. In the backward and forward going of despatches in that preoccupied and unsettled moment, it was not till near November 1 that the British Foreign Office heard from the ambassador that the American commissioners were willing so to treat, and desirous to keep their business separate from that of the Continent of Europe; but that their powers were limited to action through the mediation of Russia. Castlereagh then, on November 4, addressed a note to the United States government, offering a direct negotiation. This was accepted formally January 5, 1814;² and Henry Clay with Jonathan Russell were added to the commission already constituted, raising the number of members to five. The representatives of Great Britain were three: Admiral Lord Gambier, Henry Goulburn, and William Adams.

¹ The correspondence relating to the Russian proffer of mediation is to be found in *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, III. 623-627.

² *Ibid.*, 621-622.

The instructions issued to the American commissioners were voluminous. They contained not only the requirements of the government, but arguments from every point of view, and alternatives of several descriptions, to meet anticipated objections. Such elaboration was perhaps necessary when negotiation was to take place so remote from communication with home. On one point, however, as originally issued in contemplation of Russian mediation, demand was peremptory. Impressment must cease, by stipulation. At that moment, April 15, 1813,¹ the flush of expectation was still strong. "Should improper impressions have been taken of the probable consequences of the war, you will have ample means to remove them. It is certain that from its prosecution Great Britain can promise to herself no advantage, while she exposes herself to great expenses and to the danger of still greater losses." Nine months later, looking to direct negotiation, the same confident tone is maintained. "On impressment, the sentiments of the President have undergone no change. This degrading practice must cease. . . . No concession is contemplated on any point in controversy;"² and three weeks afterwards, February 14, 1814, "Should peace be made in Europe, it is presumed that the British Government would have less objection to forbear impressment for a specified term, than it would have should the war continue. In concluding a peace, even in case of a previous general peace in Europe, it is important to obtain such a stipulation."³ On June 27, this tone was lowered. "If found indispensably necessary to terminate the war, you may omit any stipulation on the subject of impressment." This was in pursuance of a Cabinet determination of June 27.⁴ It abandoned the only ground for war that had existed since August, 1812, when the Orders in Council were known to have been repealed. The commissioners were indeed to do their best to obtain from the British government the demanded concessions, not in the matter of impressment only, but on the whole subject of irregular blockades,

¹ *Ibid.*, 695-700.

² *Ibid.*, 701.

³ *Ibid.*, 703.

⁴ "June 27, 1814. In consequence of letters from Bayard and Gallatin of May 6-7, and other accounts from Europe of the ascendancy and views of Great Britain, and the dispositions of the great Continental Powers, the question was put to the Cabinet: 'Shall a treaty of peace, silent on the subject of impressment, be authorized?' Agreed to by Monroe, Campbell, Armstrong, and Jones. Rush absent. Our minister to be instructed, besides trying other conditions, to make a previous trial to insert or annex some declaration, or protest, against any inference, from the silence of the Treaty on the subject of impressment, that the British claim was admitted or that of the United States abandoned." *Letters and Papers of Madison*, III. 408.

which underlay the Orders in Council, as well as on other maritime questions in dispute; but in pressing such demands they were under orders to fall back before resistance. From the opening of the colloquy they were on the defensive.

Quite different was the position assumed at first by the British government and people. The events of the critical year 1813, both in Europe and America, had changed the entire outlook. Alexander Baring, whose general attitude towards the United States was friendly, wrote to Gallatin, October 12, 1813, "We wish for peace, but the pressure of the war upon our commerce and manufactures is over. They have ample relief in other quarters; indeed, the dependence of the two countries on each other was overrated." He was positive that there would be no concession on impressment. Again, on December 14, "The pressure of the war is diminished. Commerce is now abundantly prosperous."¹ Gallatin himself had occasion to spend some time in London during the succeeding spring, —1814. In a letter of April 21,—after Napoleon's abdication,—he said, "The prosecution of war with the United States would afford a convenient pretext for preserving a more considerable standing force."² This would be a useful element in the troublesome diplomacy to be foreseen, in settling the disturbed affairs of Europe; and the government stood in need of reasons for maintaining the pressure of taxation, which was already eliciting, and later in the year still more elicited, symptoms of great discontent and dangerous parliamentary opposition. Yet in its conduct towards America the Cabinet had the people behind it. Two months later, Gallatin wrote to the Secretary of State, "You may rest assured of the general hostile spirit of this nation, and of its wish to inflict serious injury on the United States; that no assistance can be expected from Europe; and that no better terms will be obtained than the *status ante bellum*."³

At the time of this writing, June 13, the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Castlereagh, returned from Paris, where he had been spending the two months succeeding the first abdication of Napoleon. During this period formal peace with France had been established, and the Bourbons reseatd on her throne. His instructions to the British commissioners at Ghent, issued July 28, were framed on lines which showed consciousness of mastery.⁴ The question of

¹ *Writings of Albert Gallatin*, edited by Henry Adams, I. 586, 592.

² *Ibid.*, 603.

³ *Ibid.*, 629.

⁴ A similar consciousness appears to the writer discernible in a letter of Wellington to Castlereagh, of May 25, 1814. To procure "the cession of Olivenza by Spain to Portugal, we could promise to bind North America, by a secret article

abandoning the practice of impressment would not be so much as entertained. The Rule of 1756 should "rest on its own clear and well established authority."¹ The commissioners were not even to discuss it. Equally decisive was the position taken with regard to questions of irregular blockades, and of compensation for seizures under the Orders in Council. When these were presented by the American commissioners, the first was waived aside, as one on which there was no difference of abstract principle; while as to the second, "you cannot be too peremptory in discouraging, at the outset, the smallest expectation of any restitution of captures made under the Orders in Council."²

Military and naval weakness, combined with the changed conditions in Europe, made the United States powerless when thus confronted with refusal. The British Secretary stood on far less sure ground, as to success, when he began to formulate his own demands. These were essentially two: suitable arrangements for the Indians, and a rectification of the frontiers. There was a third question, concerning the fisheries on the Great Banks of Newfoundland. As to these, the general right of all nations to frequent the Banks, being open sea, was explicitly admitted; but the subjects of a foreign state had no right to fish within the maritime jurisdiction of Great Britain, much less to land with their catch on coasts belonging to her. The provisions of the treaty of 1783 therefore would not be renewed, unless for an equivalent.

As regarded the Indians, an adequate arrangement of their interests was a *sine qua non* of peace; nor would a full and express recognition of present limits by itself alone fulfill this demand. There must be security for its future observance. The particular method by which this observance should be maintained was not made indispensable; but it was plainly stated in the instructions that the best means was "a mutual guarantee of the Indian possessions, as they shall be established upon the peace, against encroachment on the part of either State." The suggestion, in its logical consequence and in its intent, went to establishing the communities of Indians as a sovereign state, with boundaries guaranteed by Great Britain and the United States,—a most entangling alliance. In support of this, Castlereagh alleged that such a barrier of separation possessed a distinct advantage over a line of contact between the two guaranteeing states, such as now existed in their common boundary. The

in our treaty of peace, to give no encouragement, or countenance, or assistance, to the Spanish colonies" (then in revolt). *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Castlereagh*, third series, II. 44. The italics are mine.

¹ Castlereagh to the British Commissioners, July 28, 1814. *Ibid.*, 69.

² *Ibid.*, August 14, 1814, pp. 88, 89.

collisions incident to intercourse between red and white men were easily transferred from side to side of such a conventional line, causing continual disputes. The advantages of a buffer state, to use the modern term, would be secured by the proposed arrangement. Writing to the prime minister, the Earl of Liverpool, he said, "The question is one of expediency; and not of principle, as the American commissioners have endeavored to make it. It does not follow, because, in the year 1783, the two States, not perhaps very justly, took a common boundary, thereby assuming a sort of sovereignty over the Indians, that they may not mutually recede from that boundary, if a frontier conterminous with that of the Indians is preferable to one with each other."¹

However plausible reasoning based upon such premises might seem to the party advancing it, it could not qualify the fact that it required from the United States a large cession of territory, to be surrendered to the Indians under British guarantee. Such a demand was a dangerous diplomatic weapon to put within reach of a commission, of which Adams and Gallatin were members. In presenting it, also, the British representatives went beyond the letter of their instructions, issued by Castlereagh on July 28, and enlarged August 14. Not only was the inclusion of the Indians in the peace to be a *sine qua non*, but they wrote, "*It is equally necessary*" that a definite boundary be assigned, and the integrity of their possessions mutually guaranteed.² This paper was submitted to Castlereagh as he passed through Ghent to Paris, on his way to the Vienna Conference. "Had I been to prepare the note given in on our part, I should have been less peremptory;" but, like many superiors, he hesitated to fetter the men in immediate charge, and "acquiesced in the expression, 'It is equally necessary, etc.,' which is very strong."³ The prime minister, Lord Liverpool, was still more deprecatory. He wrote Castlereagh, "Our Commissioners had certainly taken a very erroneous view of our policy. If the negotiations had been allowed to break off upon the two notes already presented, . . . I am satisfied the war would have become popular in America."⁴

The American commissioners could see this also, and were quick to use the advantage given by the wording of the paper before

¹ Castlereagh to Liverpool, Paris, August 28, 1814. *Castlereagh Memoirs*, p. 101.

² Note of the British Commissioners, August 19, 1814. *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, III. 710. My italics.

³ Castlereagh to Liverpool, August 28, 1814. *Castlereagh Memoirs*, third series, II. 100.

⁴ Liverpool to Castlereagh, September 2, 1814. *Castlereagh MSS.*

them, to improve the status of the United States in the negotiation; for one of the great weaknesses, on which Great Britain reckoned, was the disunion of American sentiment on the subject of the war. Of their reply, dated August 24, Castlereagh wrote, "It is extremely material to answer the American note, as it is evidently intended to rouse the people upon the question of their independence."¹ Besides the Indian proposition, the British note of August 10 had conveyed also the explicit views of the British ministry as to rectification of frontier. Stated briefly, the chain of the Great Lakes was asserted to be a military barrier essential to the security of Canada, as the weaker community in North America. To assure it, no territorial cession was required; but the lakes should be in the sole military tenure of Great Britain. The United States might use them freely for commercial purposes, but should maintain on them no ship of war, nor build any fortification on their shores, or within a certain distance, to be fixed by agreement. In addition to this, on the side of the lower St. Lawrence, there was to be such a cession of the northern part of Maine as would establish a direct communication between Quebec and Halifax. The American reply of August 24² discussed these questions, patiently but instructively. The matters involved were made plain for the American reader, and the paper closed with the clear intimation that before such terms were accepted there must be a great deal more fighting. "It is not necessary to refer such demands to the American Government for instructions. They will only be a fit subject of deliberation when it becomes necessary to decide upon the expediency of an absolute surrender of national independence." So far as the British proposals went, the question was military, not diplomatic; for soldiers and seamen to decide, not for negotiators.

So it stood, and so in the solution it proved. The American commissioners held firm to this ground; while on the part of the British there was thenceforth a continual effort to escape from a false position, or to temporize until some favorable change of circumstances might enable them to insist. "The substance of the question," wrote Castlereagh to the prime minister, "is, are we prepared to continue the war for territorial arrangements. If not, is this the best time to make peace, or is it desirable to take the chances of the campaign and then to be governed by circumstances?"³ "If our campaign in Canada should be as successful as our military preparations would lead us to expect," . . . replied

¹ *Castlereagh Memoirs*, third series, II, 101.

² *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, III, 711-713.

³ Castlereagh to Liverpool, August 28. *Memoirs*, third series, II, 102.

Liverpool, "if our commander does his duty, I am persuaded we shall have acquired by our arms every point on the Canadian frontier, which we ought to insist on keeping."¹

By these considerations the next British note was dictated, and presented September 4.² It simply argued the question, with dilatory design, in a somewhat minatory tone. "I think it not unlikely," Liverpool had written with reference to it, "that the American commissioners will propose to refer the subject to their Government. In that case, the negotiation may be adjourned till the answer is received, and we shall know the result of the campaign before it can be resumed." But the Americans did not refer. They too needed time for their people to learn what now was the purpose of hostilities, which the British envoys had precipitately stated as an indispensable concession, and to manifest the national temper under the changed circumstances; but they did not choose that the matter should be stated as one open to discussion. They knew well enough the harassment of maintaining a land warfare three thousand miles from Great Britain, as well as the dangers threatening the European situation and embarrassing the British ministry. They in turn discussed at length, scrutinizing historically the several arguments of their opponents; but their conclusion was foregone. The two propositions—first, of assigning "a definite boundary to the Indians living within the limit of the United States, beyond which boundary they [the United States] should stipulate not to acquire any territory; secondly, of securing the exclusive military possession of the lakes to Great Britain—are both inadmissible. We cannot subscribe to, and would deem useless to refer to our Government, any arrangement containing either of these propositions." The British government was not permitted any subterfuge to escape from the premature insistence upon cession of territory made by their envoys, which would tend to unite the people in America; nor was it to be anticipated that prolonged hostilities for such an object would be acceptable in Great Britain.

The pre-eminence given to the Indian question by Great Britain in these negotiations was due to the importance attached by British local officials to the aid of the savages in war, and to a sensitive conviction that, when thus utilized, they should not be abandoned in peace. Their military value was probably over-estimated. It consisted chiefly in numbers, in which the British were inferior, and in the terror produced by their cruelties; doubtless, also, in some de-

¹ Liverpool to Castlereagh, September 2. Castlereagh MSS.

² *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, III. 713.

gree to their skill in woodcraft; but they were not dependable. Such as it was, their support went usually to the weaker party; not because the Indian naturally sided with the weaker, but because he instinctively recognized that from the stronger he had most to fear. Therefore in colonial days France, in later days Great Britain, in both cases Canada, derived more apparent profit from their employment than did their opponent, whose more numerous white men enabled him to dispense with the fickle and feebler aid of the aborigines.

Before the firm attitude of the note of September 9, the British government again procrastinated, and receded from demands which sound policy should from the first have recognized as untenable, unless reposing upon decisive military success and occupation. On September 19, their commissioners replied¹ that while the exclusive military possession of the lakes would be conducive to a good understanding, without endangering the security of the United States, it had not been advanced as a *sine qua non*. A final proposition on the subject of the Canadian boundaries would be made when the Indian question was settled. Concerning this, they were "authorized distinctly to declare that they are instructed not to sign a treaty of peace, unless the Indian nations are included in it, and restored to all the rights, privileges, and territories, which they enjoyed in the year 1811," by treaties then existing. "From this point the British plenipotentiaries cannot depart." They were instructed further to *offer for discussion* an article establishing Indian boundaries, within which the two countries should bind themselves not to make acquisitions by purchase during a term of years. To the absence of Lord Castlereagh, and consequent private correspondence between him and his colleagues in London, we owe the knowledge that the question of purchasing Indian lands, and the guarantee, would no longer be insisted on; and that the military control of the lakes was now reduced in purpose to the retention of Forts Michilimackinac and Niagara.² The intention remained, however, to insist upon the Indian provisions as just stated.

On September 26, the American commission replied that, as thus presented, there was no apparent difference in the purposes of the two nations as regarded the substantial welfare of the Indians themselves. The United States meant toward them peace, and the placing them in the position in which they stood before the war. "The real difference was" in the methods proposed. Great Britain "insisted on including the Indians, as allies, in the treaty of peace between her and the United States." But the Indians concerned

¹ *Ibid.*, 717.

² Bathurst to Castlereagh, September 16, 1814. Castlereagh MSS.

dwelt within the acknowledged bounds of the United States, and their political relations towards her were no concern of Great Britain; nor could any arrangement be admitted which would constitute them independent communities, in whose behalf Great Britain might hereafter claim a right to interfere. The error underlying the British demand was the assumption that the Indian tribes were independent; whereas, in their relation to foreign countries, they were merely dwellers in the United States, who had made war upon her in co-operation with Great Britain. The upshot was a mutual agreement, drawn up by the British plenipotentiaries, that upon the conclusion of peace each state would put an end to hostilities in which it might be engaged with the Indians, and would restore them to the rights enjoyed before 1811. The Americans accepted this, subject to ratification, on the ground that, while it included the Indians in the peace, it did not do so as parties to the treaty, and left the manner of settlement in the hands of each government interested. The agreement thus framed formed one of the articles of the treaty.

On September 27 the gazette account of the capture of Washington was published in London. Lord Bathurst despatched the news the same day to the commissioners at Ghent, instructing them to assure the Americans that it made no difference in the British desire for peace, nor would modify unfavorably the requirements as to frontier, as yet unstated.¹ Liverpool wrote coincidentally to Castlereagh, suggesting that he should communicate to the sovereigns and ministers at Vienna the moderation with which the government was acting, as well as the tone assumed by the American commissioners, "so very different from what their situation appears to warrant." "I fear the Emperor of Russia is half an American, and it would be very desirable to do away any prejudices which may exist in his mind, or in that of Count Nesselrode, on this subject."² The remark is illuminating as to the reciprocal influence of the American contest and the European negotiations, and also as to the reasons for declining the proposed Russian mediation of 1813. The Continent generally, and Russia conspicuously, held opinions on neutral maritime rights similar to those of the United States. Liverpool had already³ expressed his wish to be well out of the war, although expecting decided military successes, and convinced that the terms as now reduced would be very unpopular in England; "but I feel too strongly the inconvenience of a continuance not to make me desirous of concluding it at the expense of some popularity."

¹ *Castlereagh Memoirs*, third series, II. 138.

² Liverpool to Castlereagh, September 27. Castlereagh MSS.

³ September 23. *Ibid.*

It was in this spirit, doubtless, that Bathurst instructed the envoys that, if the Americans wished to refer the very modified proposals, or to sign them conditional upon ratification at home, either proposition would be accepted; an assurance repeated on October 5.¹ Were neither alternative embraced as to the Indian settlement, the negotiation should be closed and the commission return to England. British military anticipation then stood high. Not only was the capture of Washington over-estimated, but Ross and Cochrane had impressed their government with brilliant expectations. "They are very sanguine about the future operations. They intend, on account of the season, to proceed in the first instance to the northward, and to occupy Rhode Island, where they propose remaining and living upon the country until about the first of November. They will then proceed southward, destroy Baltimore, if they should find it practicable without too much risk, occupy several important points on the coast of Georgia and the Carolinas, take possession of Mobile in the Floridas, and close the campaign with an attack on New Orleans."² This was a large programme for a corps of the size of Ross's, after all allowance made for the ease with which Washington had fallen. It is probably to be read in connection with the project of sending to America very large re-enforcements; so numerous, indeed, that Lord Hill, Wellington's second in the Peninsula, had been designated for the command. This purpose had been communicated to Ross and Cochrane; and at the time of the capture of Washington they had not received the letters notifying them that "circumstances had induced his Majesty's Government to defer their intention of employing so considerable a force in that quarter."³ For this change of mind America doubtless was indebted to European considerations. Besides the expectations mentioned, the British government had well-founded reasons to hope for control of Lake Ontario, and for substantial results from the handsome force placed at the disposal of Sir George Prevost, to which the triumphant expedition of Cochrane and Ross had been intended only as a diversion.

Under these flattering anticipations were formulated the bases upon which to treat, now that the Indian question was out of the way. On October 18 and 20 Bathurst instructed the commissioners to propose, as a starting-point, the principle that each party should hold what it had, subject to modifications for mutual accommodation. "Considering the relative situation of the two countries, the

¹ *Castlereagh Memoirs*, third series, II. 148.

² Liverpool to Castlereagh, September 27, 1814. Castlereagh MSS.

³ British Public Record Office. War Office, Vol. 39. This long paper, near the end of the volume, had to the writer the appearance of a brief, drawn up for the use of the ministry in parliamentary debate.

moderation evinced by his Majesty's Government in admitting this principle, (thereby surrendering claim to the future conquests), in the present state of the contest, must be manifest." When this was accepted, but not before, the mutual accommodations were to be suggested. The present captured possessions were stated to be: British, Fort Michilimackinac, Fort Niagara, and all the country east of the Penobscot; American, Fort Erie and Fort Malden. Upon the surrender of the two latter, Great Britain would restore the forts at Castine and Machias. She would retain Mackinac and Fort Niagara, the latter with a surrounding strip of five miles of territory; and in exchange (apparently) for "all the country east of the Penobscot," would accept that part of Maine which lies north of the Aroostook river, thus insuring between Quebec and Halifax a direct communication, wholly under British jurisdiction.

There were some further minor matters of detail, unnecessary to mention; the more so that they did not come formally before the American commissioners, who immediately rejected the proposed principle of *uti possidetis*, and replied, October 24, that they were not empowered to yield any territory, and could treat only on the basis of entire mutual restitution. This Liverpool testily likened to the claim of the French revolutionary government¹ that territory could not be ceded because contrary to the fundamental law of the Republic. In the American case, however, it was substantially an affirmation that the military conditions did not warrant surrender. Meanwhile, on October 21, the news of Macdonough's victory reached London from American sources. Although the British official accounts did not arrive until some time later, Liverpool, writing to Castlereagh on that day, admitted that there could be no doubt of the defeat of the flotilla.² Despite this check, the Cabinet still cherished hopes of further successes, and were unwilling yet to abandon entirely the last inches of the ground heretofore assumed. "Had it not been for this unfortunate adventure on Lake Champlain," wrote Bathurst to Castlereagh, "I really believe we should have signed a peace by the end of this month. This will put the enemy in spirits. The campaign will end in our doing much where we thought we should have done little, and doing nothing where we expected everything."³ He announced the intention to send Pakenham in Ross's place for the New Orleans expedition, and to increase his force in the spring, should the war last till then. Meanwhile, it might be well to let the Powers assembled at Vienna

¹ Liverpool to Castlereagh, October 28. Castlereagh MSS.

² Liverpool to Castlereagh, October 21, 1814. *Ibid.*

³ Bathurst to Castlereagh, October 21, 1814. *Ibid.*

understand that, whatever the success in Louisiana, the inhabitants would be distinctly told that in no case would the country be taken under British protection. They might be granted independence, but preferably would be urged to place themselves again under the Spanish crown; but they must know that, in treating with the United States, neither of these solutions would be made by Great Britain *a sine qua non*. The government had probably taken a distaste to that peremptory formula by the unsatisfactory result of the proposition about the Indians.

This care concerning the effect produced upon the course of events at Vienna appears forcibly in the letters of Liverpool, the prime minister. After the receipt of the American commission's refusal to accept the basis of the *uti possidetis*, he wrote to Castlereagh, October 28, that he feared it put an end to any hopes of bringing the American war to a conclusion. The expectation of some favorable change in the aspect of affairs, however, decided the ministry to gain a little more time before bringing the negotiation to a close; and the envoys at Ghent were therefore to be instructed to demand a full *projet* of all the American conditions before entering on further discussion. The same day Liverpool sent a second letter,¹ in which he said distinctly that, in viewing the European settlement, it was material to consider that the war with America would probably be of some duration; that enemies should not be made in other quarters by holding out too long on the questions of Poland, Naples and Saxony, for he was apprehensive that "some of our European allies will not be indisposed to favor the Americans; and, if the Emperor of Russia should be desirous of taking up their cause, we are well aware from some of Lord Walpole's late communications that there is a most powerful party in Russia to support him. Looking to a continuance of the American war, our financial state is far from satisfactory. We shall want a loan for the ensuing year of £27,000,000 or £28,000,000. The American war will not cost us less than £10,000,000, in addition to our peace establishment and other expenses. We must expect, therefore, to have it said that the property tax is continued for the purpose of securing a better frontier for Canada." Castlereagh himself had already spoken of the financial conditions as "perfectly without precedent in our financial history."²

The renewal of the European war, avowedly dreaded by Liver-

¹ *Ibid.*

² Castlereagh to Sir H. Wellesley, September 9, 1814. *Memoirs*, third series, II. 112.

pool,¹ was thought not impossible by Castlereagh and Wellington, while conditions in France already threatened an explosion, such as Bonaparte occasioned in the succeeding March. "It is impossible," wrote Wellington, "to conceive the distress in which individuals of all descriptions are. The only remedy is the revival of Bonaparte's system of war and plunder; and it is evident that cannot be adopted during the reign of the Bourbons."² Neither he nor Castlereagh doubted the imminence of the danger. "It sounds incredible," wrote the latter, "that Talleyrand should treat the notion of any agitation at Paris as wholly unfounded."³ A plot was believed to exist, which embraced as one of its features the seizing of the Duke, and holding him as a hostage. He himself thought it possible, and saw no means in the French government's hands adequate to resist. "You already know my opinion of the danger at Paris. . . . The event may occur any night, and if it should occur, I don't think I should be allowed to depart. My safety depends upon the King's;"⁴ but he was characteristically unwilling to take any step which bore the appearance of precipitate withdrawal.

While the American negotiators were drawing up the *projet* which they had decided to present in response to the British demand, the combination of circumstances just stated led the British ministry to resolve on removing Wellington from Paris on some pretext, lest his services should be lost to them in the emergency now momentarily dreaded. The urgency for peace with America co-operated to determine the ostensible reason, which was almost a true one. The American command was offered to him. "The Duke of Wellington would restore confidence to the army, place the military operations on a proper footing, and give us the best chance of peace. I know he is very anxious for the restoration of peace with America, if it can be made upon terms at all honorable. It is a material consideration, likewise, that if we shall be disposed for the sake of peace to give up something of our just pretensions, we can do this more creditably through him than through any other person."⁵ Liverpool voiced the conclusions of the Cabinet, and it would be difficult for words to manifest more forcibly anxiety to escape from a situation. Wellington himself drew attention to this. "Does it not occur to your lordship that, by appointing me to go to America at this moment, you give ground for belief, all over Europe, that

¹ Liverpool to Castlereagh, November 2, 1814. Castlereagh MSS.

² Wellington to Liverpool, November 9, 1814. *Castlereagh Memoirs*, third series, II. 187.

³ Castlereagh to Wellington, November 21, 1814. *Ibid.*, 205.

⁴ Wellington to Liverpool, November 7 and 9, 1814. *Ibid.*, pp. 186, 190.

⁵ Liverpool to Castlereagh, November 4, 1814. Castlereagh MSS.

your affairs there are in a much worse situation than they really are? and will not my nomination at this moment be a triumph to the Americans, and their friends here and elsewhere?"¹ Conditions were alarming, but the action resembled panic.

The offer, which was really a request, brought Wellington by a side wind into the American negotiations, and enabled him to give the government the weight of his name and authority in concluding a peace otherwise than on their "just pretensions." The war, he said, has been honorable to Great Britain; meaning doubtless that, considering the huge physical mass and the proximity of the United States, it was well done to have escaped injury, as it was militarily disgraceful to the American government, with such superiority, to have been so impotent. But, he continued, neither I nor any one else can achieve success, in the way of conquests, unless you have naval superiority on the lakes. That was what was needed; "not a general, nor general officers and troops. Till that superiority is acquired, it is impossible, according to my notion, to maintain an army in such a situation as to keep the enemy out of the whole frontier, much less to make any conquest from the enemy, which, with those superior means, might, with reasonable hopes of success, be undertaken. . . . The question is, whether we can obtain this naval superiority on the lakes. If we cannot, I shall do you but little good in America; and I shall go there only to prove the truth of Prevost's defence, and to sign a peace which might as well be signed now." This endorsed not only Prevost's retreat, but also the importance of Macdonough's victory. The Duke then added frankly that, in the state of the war, they had no right to demand any concession of territory. He brushed contemptuously aside the claim of occupying the country east of the Penobscot, on the ground of Sherbrooke's few companies at Castine, ready to retreat at a moment's notice. "If this reasoning be true, why stipulate for the *uti possidetis*?"²

Penned November 9, the day before the American negotiators at Ghent handed in their requested *projet*, this letter may be regarded as decisive. November 13, Liverpool replied that the ministry was waiting anxiously for the American *projet*, . . . and, "without entering into particulars, I can assure you that we shall be disposed to meet your views upon the points on which the negotiation appears to turn at present;" the points being the *uti possidetis*, with the several details of possession put forward by Bathurst.

¹ Wellington to Liverpool, November 18, 1814. *Castlereagh Memoirs*, third series, II, 203.

² Wellington to Liverpool, November 9, 1814. *Ibid.*, 189.

Before the 18th, the American paper was in London, and Liverpool wrote to Castlereagh, "I think we have determined, if all other points can be satisfactorily settled, not to continue the war for the purpose of obtaining, or securing, any acquisition of territory. We have been led to this determination by the consideration of the unsatisfactory state of the negotiations at Vienna, and by that of the alarming situation of the interior of France. . . . Under such circumstances, it has appeared to us desirable to bring the American war, if possible, to a conclusion." The basis of the *status quo ante bellum*, sustained all along by the American commission, was thus definitely accepted and so formally stated by Bathurst, acting as Secretary for Foreign Affairs.²

This fundamental agreement having been reached, the negotiations ran rapidly to a settlement without further serious hitch; a conclusion to which contributed powerfully the increasing anxiety of the British ministry over the menacing aspect of the Continent. The American *projet*,³ besides the customary formal stipulations as to procedure for bringing hostilities to a close, consisted of articles embodying the American positions on the subjects of impressment and blockade, with claims for indemnity for losses sustained by irregular captures and seizures during the late hostilities between France and Great Britain; a provision aimed at the Orders in Council. These demands, which covered the motives of the war, and may be regarded as the offensive side of the American negotiation, were by the British at once pronounced inadmissible, and were immediately abandoned. Their presentation had been merely formal; the United States government, within its own council chamber, had already recognized that it could not enforce them. The *projet* included the agreement previously framed concerning the Indians; who were thus provided for in the treaty, though excluded from any recognition as parties to it, or as independent political communities. This was the only demand made by the commissioners which Great Britain can be said fairly to have carried, and it was so far a reduction from her original requirement as to be unrecognizable. An article, pledging each of the contracting parties not again to employ Indians in war, was rejected.

The remaining articles of the *projet*, although entirely suitable to a treaty of peace, were not essentially connected with the war. The treaty merely gave a suitable occasion for presenting them.

¹ Liverpool to Castlereagh, November 18, 1814. Castlereagh MSS.

² Bathurst to the Commissioners, December 6, 1814. *Castlereagh Memoirs*, third series, II. 214.

³ *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, III. 735.

They provided for fixing, by mixed commissions, the boundary lines between the British possessions and the United States. These the Treaty of 1783 had stated in terms which had as yet received no proper topographical determination. From the mouth of the St. Croix river, and the islands within it and in the adjacent sea, around, north and west, as far as the head of Lake Superior, the precise course of the bounding line needed definition by surveyors. These propositions were agreed to; but when it came to similar provision for settling the boundary of the new territories acquired by the Louisiana purchase, as far as the Rocky Mountains, difficulties arose. In the result it was agreed that the determination of the boundary should be carried as far as the most northwestern point of the Lake of the Woods, "in conformity with the true intent of the said Treaty of Peace of one thousand seven hundred and eighty-three." The treaty was silent on the subject of boundary westward of the Lake of the Woods, and this article of the *projet* was dropped. It differed indeed from its associates, in providing the settlement for a new question, and not the definition of an old settlement. In conclusion, the British commissioners obtained the adoption of an agreement that both parties "would use their best endeavors to promote the entire abolition of the slave trade." In Great Britain the agitation for this measure had reached proportions which were not the least among the embarrassments of the ministry; and at this critical juncture the practical politicians conducting affairs found themselves constrained by a popular demand to press the subject upon the less sympathetic statesmen of the Cabinet.

The American commissioners had made a good fight, and shown complete appreciation of the factors working continuously in their behalf. To the end, and even more evidently at the end, was apparent the increasing anxiety of the British government, the reasonable cause for it in European conditions, and the immense difficulty under such circumstances of accomplishing any substantial military successes in America. The Duke of Wellington wrote that "all the American armies of which I ever read would not beat out of a field of battle the troops that went from Bordeaux last summer;"¹ but still, "his opinion is that no military advantage can be expected if the war goes on, and he would have great reluctance in undertaking the command unless we made a serious effort first to obtain peace, without insisting upon keeping any part of our conquests."² On December 23, Liverpool sent a long and anxious

¹ *Castlereagh Memoirs*, third series, II. 188.

² Liverpool to Castlereagh, November 18, 1814. Castlereagh MSS.

letter to Castlereagh, in reply to his late letters and despatches. The fear of a renewal of war on the Continent is prominent in his consideration, and it was recognized that the size of the European armaments, combined with the pecuniary burden of maintaining them, tended of itself to precipitate an outbreak. Should that occur, France could scarcely fail to be drawn in; and France, if involved, might direct her efforts towards the Low Countries, "the only object on the Continent which would be regarded as a distinct British interest of sufficient magnitude to reconcile the country to war," with its renewed burden of taxation. "We are decidedly and unanimously of opinion that all your efforts should be directed to the continuance of peace. There is no mode in which the arrangements in Poland, Germany, and Italy, can be settled, consistently with the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris, which is not to be preferred, under present circumstances, to a renewal of hostilities between the Continental Powers." Coincidentally with this, in another letter of the same day, he mentions the meetings which have taken place on account of the property tax, and the spirit which had arisen on the subject. "This, as well as other considerations, make us most anxious to get rid of the American war."¹

The Treaty of Ghent was signed December 24, 1814, by the eight commissioners. The last article provided for its ratification, without alteration, at Washington, within four months from the signature. A *chargé d'affaires* to the United States was appointed, and directed to proceed at once in a British ship of war to America with the Prince Regent's ratification, to be exchanged against that of the President; but he was especially instructed that the exchange should not be made unless the President's was without alteration, addition, or exclusion, in any form whatsoever. Hostilities were not to cease until such ratification had taken place. The British government were apparently determined that concessions wrung from them, by considerations foreign to the immediate struggle, should not be subjected to further modification in the Senate.

Mr. Baker, the British *chargé*, sailed in the British sloop of war *Favorite*, accompanied by Mr. Carroll bearing the despatches of the American commissioners. The *Favorite* arrived in New York on Saturday, February 11. The treaty was ratified by the President, as it stood, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, on the 17th of February, 1815.

A year after the conclusion of peace, a weighty opinion as to the effect of the War of 1812 upon the national history was expressed by one of the commissioners, Mr. Albert Gallatin. For fifteen years

¹ Liverpool to Castlereagh, December 23, 1814. *Ibid.*

past, no man had been in closer touch with the springs of national life, national policy, and national action; as representative in Congress, and as intimate adviser of two consecutive Presidents, in his position as Secretary of the Treasury. His experience, the perspicuity of his intellect, and his lucidity of thought and expression, give particular value to his conclusions, the more so that to some extent they are the condemnation, regretfully uttered, of a scheme of political conduct with the main ideas of which he had been closely identified. He wrote:¹ "The war has been productive of evil and of good, but I think the good preponderates. Independent of the loss of lives, and of the property of individuals, the war has laid the foundations of permanent taxes and military establishments, which the Republicans had deemed unfavorable to the happiness and free institutions of the country. But under our former system we were becoming too selfish, too much attached exclusively to the acquisition of wealth, above all, too much confined in our political feelings to local and state objects. The war has renewed and reinstated the national feelings and character which the Revolution had given, and which were daily lessening. The people have now more general objects of attachment, with which their pride and political opinions are connected. They are more Americans; they feel and act more as a nation; and I hope that the permanency of the Union is thereby better secured."

A. T. MAHAN.

¹ May 7, 1816; *Writings of Gallatin*, I, 700.

DOCUMENTS

LETTERS OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS TO ALEXANDER HAMILTON EVERETT, 1811-1837

(First Installment.)

THE originals of the following letters are in the Library of Congress. They are here presented with the courteous permission of the librarian. They are written, with apparently only one exception—the letter of December 6, 1815—in Adams's own hand. They do not give us much definite or particular information concerning any important historical facts, but they help to bring into new and higher relief some of the qualities of the writer, and they possess moreover literary charm which gives them intrinsic interest. Alexander Hamilton Everett, to whom all the letters were addressed, is perhaps best known by his literary work, although he held various public positions of importance. Born in Boston in 1790, he was graduated at Harvard, commenced the study of law in Adams's office, and in 1809 accompanied Adams on his mission to Russia. In 1812 he returned to America and soon afterwards was appointed secretary of the legation to the Netherlands (1815). Again coming back to America he was in 1818 made *chargé d'affaires* at the Hague. In 1824 he gave up this position and in the following year was appointed by President Adams minister to Spain, a position which he retained for four years. Soon after his return to the United States he became editor of the *North American Review*, a journal to which he had already contributed a number of articles, and of which his brother, Edward Everett, had for a time been editor. This position he occupied for five years; and at the same time he was a member of the Massachusetts legislature. For a short period he served as president of Jefferson College, Louisiana, but in 1845 again entered the diplomatic service by accepting the mission to China. He died in Canton, June 20, 1847 (*Niles's Register*, LXXIII, 113, 116). The letters written to him by Adams indicate in some measure the extent of his literary and scholarly attainments. He was master of an unusually good, though we should now say a formal and somewhat stilted, style. He wrote clearly and forcibly on political, financial and economic subjects, as well as on purely literary matters.

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN.

I.

M^r A. H. EVERETT —

S^t PETERSBURG 2. September 1811.

Dear Sir.

M^r Navarro¹ has already one letter from me for you ; but it has been so long written, and his departure has been so long postponed that I am afraid before it reaches your hands it will be quite out of date. Since I wrote it, we have received your favour of 13. August enclosing that of the 11th to M^{rs} Adams.

If you had been travelling in Scotland instead of Sweden, we should certainly have concluded from a passage in the letter of the 11th that the gift of second sight had come upon you by sympathy. The second sight, I understand, beholds things as they happen, twenty-four hours before hand. Your letter of the 11th foresees the singular addition of a fair Russian in our family ; and behold on the 12th the fair Russian actually appeared. To judge from your extasies at the view of the Swedish ladies, and from certain inuendo's concerning the complexions of those you had left behind you, possibly a fair Russian is a marvel, which prophecy itself not even your own prophecy can make you believe.

I thank you much for the trouble you took to copy and send me the abstract from M^r Smith's pamphlet.² I had barely heard before I received your letter that there was such a thing, and it had much excited my Curiosity. Since then I have seen the Aurora of 26. June into which the whole pamphlet is copied. I was very sorry to see it. But there are things for which the proverb tells us there is no help.

Our tide of Americans ebbs and flows here as usual. Since you left us there have been many arrivals and some departures. The stock of your acquaintance remains much the same.

Count Pahlen³ is removed as Russian Minister, from the United States, and goes in the same capacity to the Court of Brazil. M^r Daschkoff⁴ is appointed Minister at Washington in his place. There are four Russian Gentlemen going out in the Dorothea an American vessel bound to Philadelphia — M^r Swietchkoff as Secretary of Legation, M^r Kosloff as Consul General, M^r Swienin as adjoint Consul and M^r Elidsen as private Secretary to M^r Daschkoff.

The week before last an English sloop of War, commanded by Captain Fenshaw, arrived at Reval, escorting four or five English Store-ships laden with sulphur, Saltpetre, lead and gunpowder. Captain Fenshaw wrote to his father and brothers whom you know, requesting to see them. The Store-ships came, despatched from England by the British Govern-

¹ Chevalier Navarro d'Andrade, *chargé d'affaires* from Portugal, with whom Adams had formed a pleasant acquaintance.

² Robert Smith's *Address to the People of the United States*. (Baltimore, 1811), giving an "exposition" of the circumstances which caused his resignation of the Secretaryship of State.

³ Count Theodore de Pahlen, minister to the United States from June 25, 1810, to November 14, 1811.

⁴ André de Dashkov, minister from November 15, 1811, to March 6, 1819.

ment, and their warlike burden, according to the English Newspapers was for the use of the Russian armies, to be employed against the *Common Enemy*. Those Newspapers and the ships arriving here at the same time put us all here into such a fluster, as you, who know the ground will readily conceive. There was much chuckling in one quarter. Some long faces in another. On 'change the whispering, and the buzzing, and the asserting and the denying, and the head-shaking, and the mysterious look of *Wisdom*, lasted longer than usual — four or five days at least. At last it turns out that the Emperor gave permission to General Fenshaw and his Sons to visit their Relation, on board the Sloop of War — and then he and his store ships received a notification to depart as they came, and that if they did not go with all due speed, their next notice would be that there was still *powder* and *Ball* to spare in Russia, as much as was needed to be employed against the *Common Enemy*.

You speak of having seen Baron Engeström's library at his town-house, but do not tell me whether you had seen the Baron himself. I rather infer that he was in the Country, and of course that you had not an opportunity of delivering to him my letter. I hope you received the packet I sent you by M^r Hochschild.

We are all as well as can be expected, excepting Catherine, who has been three or four days confined to her chamber with a cough and fever; but being this day able to leave it, I hope in a day or two more she will be well again.

I am, Dear Sir, truly yours

A.

II.

A. H. EVERETT Esq^r — London.

S^t PETERSBURG 28. October 1811.

Dear Sir.

I received only at the close of last week your letter of 20. September, dated at Gothenburg. We had previously heard by letters to others of your friends here, and by accounts of travellers that you had been unwell both at Stockholm and at Gothenburg, and were therefore more than usually anxious to learn from yourself of your entire recovery. Your letter was therefore peculiarly acceptable. I only marvelled that you should have thought an apology necessary for the frequency of your writing. I have been more apt to ask myself what your apology would be for not writing oftener.

I wrote you two letters by M^r Navarro, who we suppose must have overtaken you at Gothenburg. Soon after he took his departure M^r Gray¹ and M^r Jones² left us, and proceeded together for Paris. They will there be so much nearer to you than we are that I suppose you will hear directly from them before this reaches you. M^r Jones expected to go himself to London in December. A few days after they went away there came a

¹ Francis C. Gray, who for a time was attached to the American legation in Russia. Adams's *Memoirs*, II. 3.

² T. K. Jones, a young man travelling in Europe for pleasure.

letter from you to M^r Gray. I forwarded it very soon after by a Courier dispatched by the Ambassador, and as it probably travelled faster than M^r Gray, I hope he will have found it ready for him at Paris. I have had one letter from him, dated at Berlin.

If you have met M^r Navarro, he doubtless will have mentioned to you that he was present at the Christening of my daughter, whose name is Louisa-Catherine. She has hitherto been blessed with excellent health, and I think has much improved that of her mother.

We continued at the residence on the borders of the Nevka,¹ where you left us until the 8th of this Month, when we returned into the City, to a house in the near neighbourhood of that where we dwelt before. The Winter is setting in earlier than it did last year; or the year before; and at the moment when I am writing the Bridges are all displaced, and the river though not yet fixed is full of floating ice.

The report you heard at Gothenburg, of hostilities having already commenced, was, like the story of the Irishman's having been hanged, *premature*. It will be time enough for hostilities next Summer. But General Kutuzoff² has been beating the Turks; and we have had here almost ever since you left us, a Comet in full view, of such a bloody-minded appearance, that the *malignum vulgus* have been swearing the Peace against it without intermission. War or Pestilence you know has been shaken time immemorial from the horrid hair of Comets, and one of them will not be sufficient for this one which all the learned Astronomers tell us has got two tails.

I have not yet had the advantage of meeting either with Silliman's Travels,³ or with the Itinéraire.⁴ If the importance of our Countryman's observations is to be measured by the specimen you have selected, I fear he will not be able to stand a contest with the Génie du Christianisme; but M^r Prevost, who has promised me the Itinéraire, and has read it himself says there are some important occurrences in that too. Such as a Turk's firing a pistol over his own head, to frighten the traveller; and the traveller's returning the fire in like manner, to shew his intrepidity. Also the history of sundry bastonades which he administered personally to certain other Turks or Jews or some such "circumcised dogs" by way of occasionally relieving his mind from the intensity of philosophical observation. Travellers must have the privilege of sleeping sometimes, but I know not why a Yankey traveller should require more slumber than another. After all, the anecdote told by the Yale Professor is at least more credible than the project of his rival to drain all the rivers of ancient Greece, with one dash of his pen.

¹ Neva?

² Michel Ilarionovitch Kutuzov (1714-1813). From 1809-1811 he made successful war against the Turks. He is now remembered chiefly because of his struggle against Napoleon during the invasion of 1812.

³ Benjamin Silliman, *A Journal of Travels in England, Holland and Scotland and of two Passages over the Atlantic in the Years 1805 and 1806* (New York, 1810).

⁴ *Itinéraire de Paris à Jerusalem et de Jerusalem à Paris*, by Chateaubriand, the first edition of which appeared in 1811.

The most *important* Event of a public Nature, which this City has witnessed since you left it, is the consecration of the Kazan Church which took place about one month ago — and the next was the funeral service over the remains of Count Strogonoff¹ the “*Beyar*”, which was the first religious ceremony solemnized in the Church after its Consecration. It had been entirely built under the superintendence of the Count, as President of the Academy of Arts. He just lived to see the work completed, and died lamenting that as his funeral would be so magnificent, he could not be present to see it.

Among the Americans who have lately arrived here, is an acquaintance of yours, a young Mr Ingraham of Boston. He was at Gothenburg, but on Board ship while you was in that City, and I believe on the very day of the date of your letter, was disappointed of a visit he was going to make you on shore, by a signal to sail.

I am with great regard and esteem, Dear Sir, your friend and h^{ble} Serv^t

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

III.

ALEXANDER H. EVERETT Esq^r — London.

St PETERSBURG 26. January 1812.

Dear Sir.

On the cover of my last Letter to you, I minuted the receipt of your favour of 5. Dec^r enclosing the message, which I had received after having closed the letter itself. But Mr Williams, one of our Countrymen, who arrived last Summer at Archangel, being now on his way home goes with a Courier's Pass and my despatches, and I take the opportunity to thank you more particularly for this attention, and the others which you have had both in Sweden and in England of communicating to me important intelligence from our Country.

We are all in a state of convalescence from a certain distemper called the *grippe*. I know not why unless it be because it seizes people by the throat. I have it in express charge to ask you again for the *long* anecdote which you heard at Stockholm and which you did not relate, on the presumption that we had heard it before.

If you were a woman, I would tell you of all the marriages among the batchelors and virgins of this Court that are in a process of consummation or of negotiation. Marriage is to the ladies a topic so interesting per se, that they need no acquaintance, still less friendship with the parties to hear with some sort of feeling of every individual case in which it occurs. But why should I tell you of weddings between People for whom you and I have no other regard than as they belong to the Species.

The political rumours in Circulation are all of a pacific character. Peace with the Turks is supposed to be concluded, but has not yet come in official shape. Peace with France still subsists, and it is said is more

¹ Probably Alexander, Count Strogonov, 1734–1811, grand chamberlain and president of the Académie de Beaux Arts.

likely to subsist further than was expected last Summer. There is another Peace *de facto*, which will probably continue without the assistance of Treaties or Conventions.

I am, with great esteem and regard, Dear Sir, your friend and humble Serv^t

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

IV.

M^r A. H. EVERETT —

S^t PETERSBURG 10. April 1812.

Dear Sir.

I have received your favour of 3. Jan^r from London, forwarded by M^r Navarro, and although uncertain whether this letter will find you still in England, I will not pass by the opportunity of thanking you for it.

Your representation of the state of things in England, though far from being drawn in dazzling or even in gay colours, has I am convinced the more substantial merit of truth. Almost all the English travellers who have for some years past favoured the public with their observations made in America have thought proper to represent our National character as vicious, upon no better foundation than that they had witnessed in America, individual instances of Vice. The Edinburgh Reviewers, with an eye of philosophical penetration worthy of Peter Pindar's magpie peeping into a marrow-bone, prophecy that the American character, which they pronounce positively bad now, will be greatly improved, when Wealth comes to be more generally *inherited* than *acquired*.¹ If for all the moral and political pollution that the whole manufactory of English dragnets has been able to gather from all the foul bottoms of the American Continent, our improvement from the prevalence of hereditary wealth, is to consist in a substitution of *innumerable* nightly assassinations, burglaries and larcenies — Lud's men² to break stocking weavers' frames, and Irishmen to knock down for sport people as they are coming out of Church — Catholics driven to rebellion by religious persecution, and a master sacrificing his friends, his friendships and his principles for "*Panem et Circenses*", I would put it as a problem to the arithmetical acuteness of the Edinburgh Philosophers, *how much* we shall be gainers by the exchange?

I have seen in some of the newspapers that the Attorney General, Sir Samuel Romilly, in speaking officially of some of those dreadful

¹ In a review of *Travels in America* (London, 1809) by Thomas Ashe. The reviewer is not unfriendly in his tone and does not approve Ashe's efforts to "have us believe that the Americans are universally and irreclaimably vicious." "When wealth comes to be more generally inherited than acquired, there will be more refinement, both in vice and in manners: and as the population becomes concentrated, and the spirit of adventure is deprived of its objects, the sense of honor will improve with the importance of character." *Edinburgh Review*, XV, 442.

² The reference is of course to the breaking of machinery in the Luddite riots of the time. As to origin of name see Traill and Mann, *Social England*, V, 841.

enormities mentioned in your letter, lamented them as indications of a character peculiarly vicious in the English Nation. The remark might be proper in a public officer whose duties are in some sort those of a *Censor Morum*, but it would not be liberal in a foreigner, to consider transactions of such a nature as evidences of National Character. I do not so consider them. But they may fairly be taken as presumptive proofs that the representations of unparalleled virtue, and superhuman felicity, which *American* Painters have drawn as characteristic attributes of the English Nation, are as wide from the real truth, as the *Smelfungus* colouring of the British Travellers in America. This contrast of falsehood between the English pictures of America, and the American pictures of England has struck me as peculiarly remarkable, and has in no small degree mortified my patriotic feelings as an American. Its effect in our own Country has been doubly mischievous, by exciting among many of our young minds a disgust and contempt of their Countrymen, and an extravagant and foolish admiration of another Nation. I am very glad that *you* have had an opportunity of observing for yourself the real condition of Nature, of Men and of Society in England. I will not say that its tendencies will be to produce a salutary review of some of your own prejudications; but I hope and believe it will tend to correct some of the prejudices of others. You have doubtless seen much to admire, and you have too much Justice and good-sense to deprectate that which is estimable, for the place where it is found. But there is withal in England a Spirit of arrogant pretension, and a gloss of splendour, which may be seen through, without any great depth of penetration. I am well assured and the persuasion gives me pleasure, that on your return to our native shores you will be able from the heart to say with Voltaire's *Tancrède* "Plus je vis d'Étrangers, plus j'aimai ma Patrie".

As it appears that the British Government, still deem an adhesion to their Orders in Council expedient, I see no prospect of an amicable or indeed of any other arrangement of their disputes with America. Their present professions of amity and conciliation appear to be borrowed from the practice of their own Gentlemen of the Road, who take a Traveller's purse with all possible amenity and decorum. I think however their present partiality to the Orders in Council proceeds from the belief, not without reason, that they will produce a rupture between France and Russia. A very few Months will discover to the World, though probably not to them on what foundations this reliance stands.

You know the only glimpses we can catch of English Literature, are an occasional pamphlet or Review, brought by a Traveller to amuse him on the road. M^r Patterson last Summer brought some of the then latest numbers of the *Edinburgh Review*, in one of which I met that *oracular* sentence upon the National Character of the Americans, which I have just alluded to. There too I found a long, and much more amusing account of the *Curse of Kehama*;¹ it excited the wish to see the Book

¹ *The Curse of Kehama*, by Robert Southey (London, 1810).

itself. The mode of reviewing, practiced by the Edinburgh Critics is new, and they have made it fashionable. They give the title of a book, and then publish a Dissertation of their own upon the subject of which it treats. Their Essays are tinctured with strong prejudices, mingled up with a curious compound of scholastic dogmatism, and fine gentlemanliness. I remember reading an Account in one of their former numbers, of a voluminous edition or translation of Sallust, in which they said *they* had been accustomed to read Sallust in books *about the size of a hand at whist*. I read however almost all their Treatises; and many of them with entertainment and instruction. In the Review of the Lady of the Lake¹ there is a disquisition upon the sources of Walter Scott's popularity as a Poet, with which I was very much pleased. Some of its ideas are repeated in the review of Southey's *Curse* — and while they tell us here how Mr Southey does not do so and so like Mr Scott, they inform us on the other hand how Mr Scott does not use the machinery of Mr Southey. *Don Roderick*,² I have not yet seen, but among the readers of Poetry here there are some who have and who say it is the author's Master Piece. That I suppose, is because, as was said to account for the vogue of another book, it is Poetical, Political and Personal. If *Don Roderick* is a great admirer of Lord Wellington, he ought to give at the same time his candid opinion of the Duke of Albufera.

I condole with you upon the extinction of that illustrious luminary of letters and Science the monthly Anthology.³ If the General Repository of Literature,⁴ gives but once a quarter to the Public as much wit and as much Wisdom, as the Anthology was wont to emit every Month, it will deserve as long a life, and enjoy as fair a prospect of immortality.

It may awaken some of your most familiar, if not your warmest recollections of Russia, to tell you that hitherto, we have scarcely the slightest indication of the breaking up of Winter. In reference merely to the thermometer it has been the mildest of the three that we have overlived here; but the Neva has already been solid very little short of six Months, and the Snow is at this moment as deep or deeper than it has been at any part of the Season. To us it has been a Winter of sickness and affliction. My family remains as when you left us; excepting the addition of our daughter.

I have little to say about the political aspect of affairs, because wherever my letter may find you, it is probable the expected War will have had the start of it. From the manner in which France and Russia are holding the sword over each others head it would seem that both parties "no second stroke intended". All the regiments of Guards have already marched from St Petersburg; the Minister at War, who is

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, XVI. 263-293.

² *The Vision of Don Roderick*, published July 15, 1811.

³ *The Monthly Anthology and Boston Review*, published from 1803 to 1811. Everett was himself a contributor. The paper was used by the Anthology Club of Boston as a vehicle of communication with the public.

⁴ *The General Repository and Review*, which began to be published in Cambridge in 1812.

the Commander in Chief of the principal army, and the Grand Duke are gone, and the Master goes perhaps to-morrow. The Ambassador and the Ministers of the Confederation are still here, but on the wing. Two persons of high distinction have been dispatched very lately to Siberia, or — elsewhere.

I am, Dear Sir, ever truly your's

A.

V.

A. H. EVERETT Esq^r Boston.

GHENT 16. July 1814.

Dear Sir,

The pleasure that I never fail to derive from your Communications has hitherto been attended by two Circumstances, the impression of which upon my mind has been to give them additional value, though in their own Nature such as I could not but regret. The first is the length of time that elapses between them; and the second the lapse of time after they are written, when I have the good Fortune to receive them. Since your return to the United States, this enjoyment has befallen me but twice — first by your letter of 12. February 1813. which I answered on the 10th of the ensuing June; and secondly by yours of 25 June 1813. which in little less than twelve Months from its date was received by me on the Road from Stockholm to Gothenburg, in the Night of the 2^d and 3^d of the last Month. I had myself written to you on the 10th of October 1812. in answer to your last Letter from England, forwarded by M^r Poletica.¹ I am not without apprehension that you have never received this, for I know that a Letter to another of my friends in America, nearly of the same date, and sent by the same conveyance was not received by him so late as in January last. I gave them both to a M^r Jackson of Newbury-Port, whom I furnished with a Courier's Passport, and who also took Dispatches for the Government. I have understood that he arrived in America in March 1813, and I believe that he transmitted to Washington the Dispatches. What disposal of the private letters he made, I am not informed. That for you, I was especially desirous that you should receive in due time, because it contained the Certificate which you had requested in your Letter from London. I would now send you a duplicate of both, but the Certificate would be useless to you, and the Letter has nothing in it to deserve that a second copy of it should be taken, particularly, as I have not here the aid of any Secretary.

I have also reason to fear that my Letter of 10 June 1813. had not been received by you so late as the 16th of March last. I gave it to M^r J. W. Smith, who was going to London, and who died there in February. Other Letters which I sent at the same time by M^r Tilden reached their destination in due Season, but I know that one of the Letters taken by M^r Smith, and which was to my Mother had not been received by

¹ Pierre de Poletica, formerly secretary of legation under Count Pahlen in America.

her, and I have no reason to hope that the others which I committed to the same Gentleman were more fortunate.

If these conjectures are well founded you have not yet since your return to the United States, received one Letter from me, and you have cause to think me a Correspondent more neglectful, or at least deficient in punctuality, than I would willing be thought by any person who takes the trouble of writing to me; and most especially by you to whom I should be peculiarly solicitous of appearing in the light the most opposite to that of negligence. I mentioned in my last Letter to you that I had received and read with *poetical* Pleasure your brother's *Φ. B. H.* poem,¹ though I had not been equally gratified by its *political* complexion. I have learnt since then, from my Mother, that he has assumed the arduous and honourable task of succeeding our lamented friend Buckminster; an occasion upon which he might emphatically say "who is sufficient for these things."² I have the satisfaction of being one of the Proprietors in that Church, and I look forward with pleasure to the period, when with my family, I shall be an habitual attendant upon his ministration. I will not promise to agree with him in Politics, nor even in religious doctrine; but there is one, and that the most essential point upon which I am confident we shall never disagree — I mean Christian Charity.

I regret that with your Letter I had not the pleasure of receiving the copy of your address to the Charitable Fire Society, and I have heard from other Quarters of certain political Speculations of yours, which I have more than one reason for wishing to see. As your design of entering upon the field of public discussion has been carried into Execution, and as American Principles are the foundation of the system to which you have pledged your exertions, you will not doubt the interest which I shall take in every step of your career. Notwithstanding the inauspicious appearances of the present moment, I humbly trust in God, that American Principles will ultimately prevail in our Country. But should it be otherwise; in the inscrutable decrees of Divine Providence, should the greatness and Prosperity, to which the continuance of the Union cannot possibly fail of exalting our Native Country, be deemed too great for mortal man to attain; should we be destined to crumble into the vile and miserable fragments of a great Power, petty, paltry principalities or Republics, the tools of a common Enemy's malice and Envy, and drenching ourselves age after age in one another's blood; far preferable should I deem it to fall in the Cause of Union and of Glory, than to triumph in that of Dismemberment, Disgrace and Impotence. As Christians, whatever befalls us or our fellow men we must submit to the Will of Heaven; but in *that* case I should be tempted to say with Lucan "Victrix Causa Dis placuit, Sed Victa Catoni."

¹ The subject was "American Poets". See "Tribute to Edward Everett" by George Ticknor, *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings*, 1864-1865, p. 134.

² Edward Everett, then not twenty years of age, succeeded Joseph Stephen Buckminster as minister of the Brattle Street Church in Boston.

The failure of the attempt at Negotiation under the mediation of the Emperor of Russia, by the refusal of the English Government to treat with us under that mediation has long since been known to you; and before this Letter comes to your hands you will have learnt how and why the substituted Negotiation which was to have been held at Gothenburg has been transferred to this City. The Original proposal of Gothenburg, and the removal hither were both suggested on the British side, and merely assented to on our part. I have been here upwards of three weeks, waiting only for British Commissioners, who might at any time be here in three days, and who well know that all the members of the American Mission are here. From these Circumstances you may judge of the disposition of the British Government with regard to Peace, and probably you may have very shortly still more decisive evidence to the same point.

Of the late Revolutions on the Continent of Europe it is scarcely possible to speak without prejudice in reference to the past, or without presumption with regard to the future. The minds of men are still too much heated on all sides to form a deliberate judgment, either upon the nature and tendency of Events, or upon the character and conduct of persons. The only thing of which there can be no question is the overthrow of the Power of France, accomplished by the overthrow of Napoleon Buonaparte. France from the first can scarcely claim the fourth place in the Rank of European Nations. From the Mistress she has become the foot-ball of Europe. It is for the Bourbons to *restore* her to her place, as she, or rather England, has restored them to their's. I wish they may prove adequate to the task.

I am, Dear Sir, sincerely and faithfully your's

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

VI.

A. H. EVERETT Esq^r The Hague.

LONDON 27 July 1815.

Dear Sir

Your favours by M^r Dana, by the two M^r White's, and by your brother had been received by me, since my arrival here; and I had been apprehensive that your voyage would still be postponed; so that your's of the 17th from the Hague would have been an unexpected pleasure, but for the previous arrival at Liverpool of the Panther, one of whose Passengers informed me that she had sailed from Boston, the same day with the Congress.

I congratulate you upon your introduction to the regular diplomatic career. When M^r Smith had concluded last Summer to return to the United States, I wrote to the Secretary of State, requesting that if I was to return to Russia, you might be appointed Secretary to that Legation. As there was then no prospect that the Negotiation at Ghent would terminate in Peace, and consequently none of a mission to this Country, I merely added that if such a mission had been the result of the Negotia-

tion, and confided to me, as I had received notice was the President's intention, I should still have requested that you might be the Secretary to the Legation. That my recommendation of you was earnest I now the more readily avow, because I gave by it a large pledge to the Government of our Country, which it is for you to redeem. I assured the Secretary of State, that in presenting you to the President's Consideration, I was governed more by motives of zeal for the public service, than of personal friendship for you. My Sentiments are still the same. For my own satisfaction, and for the pleasure of your Society I wish that you had received the appointment, as Secretary to this Legation. I shall write to the Secretary of State, and renew the request that you may be appointed to it. But for the public Service, and for your own advantage, you are for the present at least, perhaps as well, perhaps better situated than you would be here. My own residence here will very probably be short. Every American who has resided so long as five or six years in Europe, ought to go home to be *new-tempered*. I recommend this to your future practice, as during my whole life, I have found the benefit, and necessity of it for my own.

At an earlier and more perilous age, you have once passed unhurt through the ordeal of European Seductions and Corruptions. I have the confident hope that one victory will be the earnest of another. But you will not deem it impertinent if I intreat you to "keep your heart with all diligence". The fascinations of Europe, to Americans situated as you are and may hereafter be, present themselves in various and most dissimilar forms — Sensuality — Dissipation — Indolence — Pride, — and last, and most despicable, but not least — Avarice. This though not so common as the rest is not less dangerous and not less to be avoided. It appears in temptations to trading speculation or stock-jobbing, upon the basis of information to which your public station only gives you access. Perhaps you may not be exposed to this species of allurements. And if you should I am sure you will need no warning voice to preserve you from it.

I have many very pleasing recollections of the Country, and particularly of the spot where you reside. I inhabited the Hague, at several different, and always at interesting periods of my life. You will find it necessary to be particularly attentive to your health, as foreigners who reside some time in Holland are often subject to attacks of intermittent fevers. The Hague is however more favourably situated than Amsterdam.

You will oblige me, by enquiring if a family by the name of *Veerman*, *Saint Serf*, now reside at the Hague; and if they do, by calling upon them, with my compliments and kind remembrance. The Lady, is the daughter of a M^r Dumas, who during the War of our Revolution was agent for the United States at the Hague, and after the War was for some time Chargé d'Affaires. When I was last at the Hague, from 1794 to 1797, she was married to this M^r Veerman and had two or three children. I passed through the Hague last Summer on my way to Ghent, but could not stop even to alight from the Carriage. I have not heard

from this family for many years ; but it would give me great pleasure to be informed of them, and especially of their welfare.

M^r Buchanan does me the favour to take charge of this Letter. He is strongly recommended to me, by several highly respected friends, and I am persuaded you will find in him an agreeable associate. Let me hear often from you, and believe me truly your's

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

VII.

A. H. EVERETT Esq^r — The Hague.

BOSTON HOUSE, EALING — NEAR LONDON 31. August 1815.

Dear Sir.

I find upon my files a friendly and very agreeable Letter from you, dated Boston 28. Oct^r 1814. which I received on the 24th of March last at Paris. I did not then answer it, because I knew already of your destination to Europe, and I can now only acknowledge the receipt of it, because M^r Langdon, who is kind enough to take this Letter, goes immediately, and I have the receipt of two other favours from you to acknowledge. They are of the 3^d and 9th instants, the former by M^r Haven, with a Copy of the new Constitution of the Netherlands, for which I thank you.

Your project of occupying your leisure by a historical sketch of the Country where you reside, I have no doubt will prove useful to yourself and to others. The whole interest of the Dutch history is concentrated in the Period of its existence as a Republic ; which began at the separation of the Country from the dominion of Spain, and ended by the invasion of the French in 1794. There is now again an Independent Government — but it commences as a Monarchy, without any distinctive Characteristic. The Republic is no more ; and the Nation is no longer the same.

Among your occupations I would recommend to you that of making yourself completely master of the French language — to write it, as you do your own. It is the diplomatic language of the whole European Continent, and I wish you to possess it so as never to depend upon a translator. This is the only Country in Europe, where the French is of no use to a foreign legation.

Should I return the ensuing Spring to the United States, as is highly probable, it will be solely with the view of attending to my private concerns ; to see once more my aged Parents, and to devote my time to the education of my Children. I shall have no objects of a public Nature whatsoever ; and to be candid, the conclusive inducement to return will be the want of means to remain where I am.

Wherever I may be, there you will have a sincere and faithful friend.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

VIII.

A. H. EVERETT Esq^r — The Hague.

LONDON 6th Dec^r 1815.

Dear Sir

Since I wrote you last, I have had the pleasure of receiving four Letters from you. The first of June 25th 1813 was presented by M^r Coffin; the second of 31st of July last by your elder Brother; and the others, of 31st August and 4 of Oct^r the receipt of which I should not have been so long in acknowledging, but for an inflammation of the eyes, similar to that with which you may remember I was once afflicted at S^t Petersburg; but much more severe and of much longer continuance. It has for nearly two months in a great measure deprived me of the use of the pen, and still obliges me to write by another hand.

I am very glad that you have made the acquaintance of my friend, (if I was not speaking of a Lady, I should say, my very old friend) Madame Veerman, and her family. True it is, that I have many times held both her daughters, respectable Matrons though now they be, upon my knees: but that was far from being my first acquaintance with her; I have seen her as fair a blossom as any of the Gardens of Harlem ever produced; and in the change of Features upon her countenance, between that period, and the time when I found her married and the Mother of two Children, I have some reason for supposing that the Grandmother of this day must retain few traces of the Virgin bloom which more than thirty years ago I saw upon her face. I pray you to present my best respects to her and to her daughters, who I am glad to hear are married and I hope are well settled in life.

I have been much edified by the philosophical and benevolent reflections which your visit to Bruxelles and the Inauguration or Coronation combined with the Field of Waterloo excited in your mind. They appear to me to be far preferable to the Poetical inspiration which M^r Walter Scott found, or at least went to seek upon the aforesaid field. I have heard and read something before about a week at Bruxelles, and a famous Tree where the Hero who was then *bankrupting* a Nation's gratitude is said to have remained, though not to have reposed, during a part of the first day's action. The Ancient sage Philosopher in Hudibras could prove, you know, that the world was made of fighting and of love, and I cannot imagine any means so effectual for promoting your project of perpetual peace as an enactment of an universal law that the shelter of the Tree of Waterloo shall henceforth be exclusively reserved for the belle Alliance which was sheltered by the Tree of Nivelle.

There was nearly a century ago a poor French Abbé named S^t Pierre,¹ who published in three Volumes a project for perpetual peace between the Powers of Europe which he sent to Cardinal Fleury, whose dear delight was Peace. The Cardinal's answer to him was "vous avez oublié Monsieur, pour Article preliminaire, de commencer par envoyer une

¹ Charles Irénée Castel de Saint Pierre (1658-1743), Abbé de Tiron. His *Projet de Paix Perpetuelle*, in three volumes, was published in 1713.

Troupe de Missionnaires, pour disposer le cœur et l'esprit des Princes''. This little difficulty suggested by the Cardinal still subsists; and if in the pursuit of your plan you should avoid committing the Abbe's error, and send your Troup of Missionaries there would still be the chance whether they might be all gifted with the power of persuasion sufficient to ensure their success; besides the possibility that the Missionaries themselves might require a second band of pacific Apostles, to keep them faithful to their duty.

But not to trifle upon so serious a subject; Peace on Earth and good will to Men, was proclaimed nearly two thousand years since, by one with whose authority no human power is to be compared. It was not only proclaimed, but the means of maintaining it were fully and most explicitly furnished to Mankind. This authority is acknowledged, and its precepts are recognized as obligatory, by all those who exhibited the practical comment upon it in the Field of Waterloo. It is most emphatically acknowledged, by the most Christian personages who are yet commenting upon it, in the Dungeon's of the Spanish Inquisition, and in the Butcheries at Nismes.

With these results of the holy War for the preservation of social order and of Religion yet glaring before me, I cannot promise you very speedy success in the laudable purpose of eradicating the seeds of discord from the human heart. But if in your disappointment you stand in need of consolation, I recommend to your meditations the Theory of the ingenious M^r Malthus.¹ He perhaps may prove to your satisfaction that the real misfortune of Europe is to be overburthened with Population; or if he should fail in that, he may at least convince you that the population of Europe is neither more nor less for such Fields as that of Waterloo. The number of Officers who gloriously fell upon that memorable day, made no chasm in the Military establishment of the Conquerors. The London Gazette within ten days afterwards filled up all the vacancies which that day had made in the British Army and M^r Malthus insists that it is precisely the same with the process of population: that wherever one mouth is removed, another will immediately be produced to take its place. If this theory be just, you might perhaps find occasion to re-consider the project of perpetual peace even if it should be practicable: for it would be necessary to take into the account, the mass of glory which you would deprive so many Heroes of acquiring, in exchange for their worthless lives, and also the immense multitudes of little candidates for existence, whom you would cruelly debar from the possibility of coming into life. It would be a sort of murder of the Innocents, that would out-Herod Herod.

I am informed that there is in this Letter a mixture of solidity and

¹ An interesting statement in light of the fact that Everett later devoted considerable attention to the theories of Malthus. See his *Europe: or a General Survey of the Political Situation of the Principal Powers with Conjectures on their Future Prospects* (London and Boston, 1822); also *New Ideas on Population with Remarks on the Theories of Godwin and Malthus* (Boston, 1823).

levity which makes it proper to bring it to a conclusion. I have as yet no answer from the Government to the proposal which I made for an exchange which would give me the benefit of your assistance, but I have intimations from a private source, that a different arrangement has been made. I shall regret the circumstance on my own account, though in the present condition of my Eyes, it will probably be an advantageous one to you. I wrote last Week to M^r Eustis, and beg to be remembered kindly to him now; being with the highest regard and esteem Dear Sir, your friend.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

IX.

A. H. EVERETT Esq^r Secretary of Legation of U. S. The Hague.

EALING NEAR LONDON 16. March 1816.

Dear Sir.

Since I had the pleasure of last writing you, three of your favours have come to my hands. The first dated 11. March 1815. at Boston, which you had given as a Letter of recommendation to M^r Copeland. By some accident he left it at the New-England Coffee-House in London, where it remained forgotten in a drawer, with several others from my family-relations, from April when M^r Copeland arrived in England, until the beginning of January, when the Master of the Coffee-house found it, and sent it to me. Your second Letter the receipt of which I am to acknowledge is of 13. December last, and was brought by M^r Apthorp. The third of 21. Dec^r introductory to M^r Chad, who is to go out as Secretary of the British Legation to the United States. I have hitherto missed of the pleasure of seeing this Gentleman, but hope to have it this day.

Your Letter of 11. March 1815. principally relates to two subjects, now obsolete enough; but one of which, the Victory at New-Orleans, will always be in Season, to the memory of Americans; and the other, the Peace of Ghent, will I hope prove to be likewise composed of durable materials. Judging, as the character of all political measures should be judged, from the existing Circumstances of the Time, the Peace was undoubtedly seasonable, and was probably as good a one as could then have been obtained; but all who like you, have devoted their lives to the honour and welfare of their Country, will remember that the Peace did not obtain the objects for which the war was waged. From which every mind not besotted by the Spirit of Faction, may draw two conclusions—one of caution against commencing War, without a fair prospect of attaining its objects, as well as a good cause. The other that the object of the last War, must perhaps, and not improbably be fought for again. In an enlarged point of View, the War was much more beneficial than injurious to our Country. It has raised our national character in the eyes of all Europe. It has demonstrated that the United States, are both a military and a naval Power, with capacities which may hereafter place them in both these respects on the first line among the Nations of the Earth. It has given us Generals and Admirals, and subordinate officers by land and sea, to whom we may hereafter look with

confidence for the support of our national rights and interests in War, if the necessity should recur. It has partly removed the prejudice against that best and safest of National defences, an efficient Navy. And it has shewn us many secrets of our own strength and weakness, until then, not sufficiently known to ourselves, and to which it is to be hoped we shall not hereafter wilfully shut our eyes. But some of the worst features in our composition that it has disclosed are deformities which, if not inherent in the very nature of our Constitution, will require great, anxious and unremitting care to enable us to outgrow them. The most disgusting of them all, are the rancorous spirit of faction, which drove one part of the Country headlong towards the dissolution of the Union, and towards a treacherous and servile adherence to the Enemies of the Country. This desertion from the standard of the Nation, weakened all its exertions to such a degree, that it required little less than a special interposition of Providence to save us from utter disgrace, and dismemberment, and although the projects of severing the Union were signally disconcerted by the unexpected conclusion of the Peace, they were too deeply seated in the political systems as well as in the views of personal Ambition, of the most leading men in our native State to be yet abandoned. They will require to be watched, exposed, and inflexibly resisted, probably for many years.

You have doubtless been informed that a few days after I last wrote you, Mr J. A. Smith arrived here, as Secretary of Legation to this Court and since the meeting of Congress his appointment has been confirmed by the Senate. Whether the Government inferred from his personal relation to me, that this appointment would of course be agreeable to me, or whether it was made upon distinct Considerations, and without reference to my wishes at all, I think it necessary, from what had previously passed between you and me to state, that your name is the only one that I ever recommended to the Government for the Office, and that although I knew he had been recommended for it by others, his appointment to it, was altogether unexpected by me, until I was informed it had actually taken place.

It is natural that you should entertain some solicitude, with regard to your future prospects, and your idea is just that the situation of Secretary to an American Legation in Europe is no permanent Prospect for a condition in Life. The Government of the United States have no system of diplomatic gradation, and the instances of Persons who have commenced as Secretaries of Legation, and afterwards received higher appointments have been very few. But the reason of this has been, because most of the Secretaries have been young men, who obtained the appointments by the influence and solicitations of their friends, and who after obtaining them think much more of their own pleasure than of the public service. They come to Europe not to toil, but to enjoy, To dangle about Courts, and solace themselves for the rest of their lives, with the delightful reflection that Kings or Princes have looked at them — to see sights — to frequent theatres, Balls, Masquerades and fashionable Society.

I speak not of those who have sunk into baser and more vicious pursuits. Nor of those who come to make themselves scientific, or virtuosi. Scarcely one in fifty ever came to do his duty, and nothing but his duty, Or to devote his leisure to the acquisition of the proper diplomatic knowledge. The habits of life into which they fall relax their industry into indolence and turn their activity to dissipation. They go home with heads as empty, and with hearts fuller of vanity than they came — generally with a hankering to return to Europe, and almost always with a distaste to the manners, and institutions of their own Country. Disdaining or disqualified to take a part in its public affairs, and incapable of making themselves necessary, either to the General Government, or to any of the political parties in the Country.

Nothing of all this applies to you. Had your station been assigned to the Mission here, you would have found that the mere drudgery of the Office would have absorbed all, and more than all your time. At the Hague you have much leisure, and I am quite sure you are making good use of it. You will never for an instant forget that you are responsible to your country for the employment of every hour. That every moment not devoted to the discharge of present duty, must be given to the acquisition of future capability. You will never adopt the fancy of the School-boy, who left School and went home, because he had *learned out*. But as you have asked my advice, I cannot in candour recommend it to you, to remain long in your present station under the idea that it will lead to something better. After a suitable period, properly employed, I should say, return home, and resume your station at the Bar. Take an interest and exercise an influence in the public affairs. You must steel your heart, and prepare your mind to encounter multitudes of political enemies, and to endure all the buffetings, without which there is no rising to distinction in the American world. When the knaves and fools open upon you, in full pack, take little or no notice of them, and be careful not to lose your temper. Preserve your private character and reputation unsullied, and confine your speculations upon public concerns to objects of high and national importance. You will certainly be favoured with no Patronage, political or professional by the prevailing party at Boston, but you must make your way in opposition to and in defiance of them. Their system is rotten to the core, and you may render essential service to the Nation, by persevering exertions against it. I will give you one word, which you may lay down as the foundation of the whole political system, to which you may boldly and safely devote from this moment all the energies of your character, all your talents and all your Genius — that word is *Union*. Let that be the centre, from which all your future exertions emanate, and to which all your motives tend — let your conduct be at once bold, resolute, and wary — preserve inflexibly your personal independence, even while acting in concurrence with any party, and take my word for it, you will not need to go in search of public-Office, at home or abroad. For Public-Office, at home or abroad, at your option will soon come in search of you.

Be good enough to present my best remembrance to M^r Eustis, to whom I am yet indebted for a letter, and propose shortly to write. M^r Apthorp did not bring Turreau's book upon America.¹ That illustrious Vendean General told me last Spring that he intended to publish a Book against us. I did not think the worse of him or of ourselves for that. Laudari a laudato has a counterpart, which will easily reconcile me to his vituperation.

Our accounts from the United States, do not appear propitious to your projects of perpetual Peace. Onis the Spaniard,² they say, has sprung a mine at Washington and gone off. But I have not room to expatiate, and must remain ever faithfully yours.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

X.

A. H. EVERETT Esq^r Boston.

WASHINGTON 28. Sept^r 1817.³

Dear Sir,

During the few days that I passed at Boston, I called several times both at your house and at your Office, for the purpose of having some conversation with you as well upon the subjects referred to in your Letter of the 23^d inst^t which I received yesterday, as upon some others. My last visits were on the day before I left Boston to come here, when I found at your Office door a notice that you was out of town, and was informed at your house that you and your Lady were gone upon an excursion to Portsmouth. I seriously regretted the Circumstance, as I was desirous of communicating with you more fully and more confidentially, than either my time, or some other considerations will admit of in writing. This however is now the only remaining expedient of intercourse between us, and I take the hour before the dawn of the day of rest, for the purpose.

I arrived here on Saturday the 20th inst^t and saw the President the same evening. He was obliged to leave the City again on Monday Morning for his Seat in Virginia, and the only conversation that I had with him was upon objects concerning which he had instructions to leave with me. Upon his return I will not fail to mention your Letter to him, and ascertain if he received it.

If you will transmit to me your accounts with the United States, with the vouchers if there are any, I will deliver them over to the Auditor for the Department of State, and attend to their being passed through the various offices for settlement.

¹ *Aperçu sur la Situation Politique des États-Unis d'Amérique*, par le Général Turreau, ancien ministre plénipotentiaire de France aux États-Unis d'Amérique (Paris, 1815).

² Don Luis de Onís, minister from Spain. The allusion is probably to his efforts to bring about the prosecution of persons threatening the Spanish possessions. *American State Papers, For. Rel.*, IV. 422.

³ Mr. Adams had now become Secretary of State in the cabinet of President Monroe.

With regard to your return to the diplomatic career, I consider the prospect of your services to the public in that line, as so favourable, that I shall not hesitate to recommend you to the President for employment, if any situation should present itself, in the class of those which would be acceptable to you.

From the Correspondence of M^r Eustis,¹ it appears to be his intention to return next Spring, to the United States; unless in the meantime, a Minister of rank corresponding to his, should be appointed by the King of the Netherlands to reside here. Should he return, a *Chargé d'Affaires* will I presume be appointed to reside at that Court, and as the President in anticipation of such an Event had already offered you the situation, I suppose, and so far as I may expect to be consulted in the selection, intend that it shall be offered to you again. I am not inclined without a clear and obvious propriety to multiply the diplomatic agents of the United States in Europe, and probably the next Congress will be as little disposed as I am to aggravate unnecessarily the public expences in that department. But before I left England I was informed that the King of Prussia had appointed a *Chargé d'Affaires* to the United States, and I was led to expect that he would before now have arrived in this Country. Should such an event take place, the appointment of a person with the same character may be judged advisable, and may perhaps meet the sanction of Congress. In that case, or in any other that may occur of a similar nature, in which I can with propriety present your name to the President, you may be assured I shall be neither backward nor cold in recommending you.

I have read all the numbers upon the present State of England, that have been published since I landed at New-York,² and am sure I shall take great pleasure in reading the remainder. That they have been received by the public with more attention than they deserve is by no means my opinion. That they should have been ascribed to me would have been one of the highest compliments that could have been paid me, if I could have recognized as mine, many of their sentiments. But the argument against the theory of the checks and balances, would scarcely have been decent from my pen, if I had even been convinced of its correctness, which I am not. It would have been inconsistent too with the opinions which I have always avowed; and particularly with a series of papers which in the year 1791, I published in the *Boston Centinel*, under the signature of *Publicola*. They encountered instead of flattering the prevailing prejudices of the time, and were very unpopular. They are now and have been long since forgotten by the Public, but I am not conscious of having changed any important opinion contained in them.

¹ William Eustis, 1753-1825. member of Congress 1801-1805 and 1820-1823; Secretary of War 1807-1813; minister to Holland 1814-1818; governor of Massachusetts 1823-1825.

² "Letters to a Friend on the Present State of England," published in the *Patriot and Chronicle* and reprinted in the *Boston Weekly Messenger* beginning June 17, 1817, and some of them at least in the *Boston Daily Advertiser* beginning June 17.

Their view of the British Constitution is altogether different from yours, and although I do ample Justice to the ingenuity of your argument against Montesquieu, I have not been convinced by it. I cannot compress into this short Letter an argument that would exhaust a volume, and probably leave you on your side "of your own opinion still," but to deal with you in perfect candour, your view of the British Constitution, of its operation, and I might perhaps add of the present State of England, is not impartial. If you and Walsh¹ were Painters and had to take the Portrait of a one-eyed man, you would both paint him in profile but your picture would shew the blind and his the seeing side. He would conceal the loss of the eye, and you would represent the man as blind. You know it is a trite maxim in natural philosophy that a mathematical truth is a physical falsehood. The practice of no machine ever corresponds precisely with its theory. What would you say to an Englishman who should aver that the Constitutions of the United States are all impostures, and that we have nothing but a Government of Caucuses? These are Engines unknown to our Constitutions and Laws, but not less operative upon the Administration of our Governments than what Cobbett calls the borough-mongering faction is upon that of England. As to the general state and condition of the Country, I must say that no Country or People that I have ever visited, present more solid, more numerous or more noble topics for panegyric than England. That she presents at the same time numerous topics for the severest and most indignant reprobation is equally true. Your papers are admirably calculated to eradicate from the minds of our Countrymen, every prejudice in her favour. To do her entire Justice would require another series of Essays, an eye more upon the search for the forms and a hand more ready for the delineation of beauty. The eye and the hand are your own; and why should the disposition be wanting? You have a heart, not insensible to beauty, physical, moral or intellectual—why should you hide its feelings from itself? You know that the Agriculture of England is superior to that of any other Country—That in most of the useful, and some of the ornamental Arts, she is surpassed by none—That her learning, literature and Science equal if they do not exceed those of any other Nation—That in arms she stands at least upon a level with the first military Nations of the age by land, and that she reigns but too triumphant and unrivalled upon the Ocean. Is all this the result of despicable or pernicious institutions? If England had no other claim to reverence than that of having founded the Colonies, which are now your Country and mine, her solid and unquestionable glory would transcend all Greek, transcend all Roman fame. France, Spain, Portugal, and Holland, have founded Colonies as well as England;—look at them,

¹ Robert Walsh, 1784-1859, wrote *A Letter on the Genius and Disposition of the French Government, including a View of the Taxation of the French Empire* (1810, several editions). Its tone was favorable to England. His best known work is *An Appeal from the Judgments of Great Britain respecting the United States of America* (Philadelphia, 1819).

and look at the United States. And what is the cause of the difference between them? English Institutions, Principles and Manners. Milton tells us that the very Spirits reprobate lose not all their virtue, and has accordingly endowed his fallen Angels, with virtues of the highest order. He has given the Devil his due, and I think you should do the same with England.

I believe there is a little account between you and me to settle, for the two years that you was in my Office, before our departure for Europe. I mention it now, not for the sake of asking you for the settlement, for that shall be entirely at your convenience, but because never having been adjusted it may perhaps have escaped your recollection.

With my best Respects for your Lady, and the highest esteem and regard for yourself, I remain, dear Sir, ever faithfully yours

J. Q. ADAMS.

XI.

ALEX^r H. EVERETT Esq^r Boston

WASHINGTON 23. Nov^r 1817.

Dear Sir.

I congratulate you very cordially upon your success at the Election. I certainly know not a man in our district more calculated to represent it with dignity to the Nation with honour to himself, and with advantage to his Constituents than Mr Mason.¹ I am also highly gratified with the moderation, the conciliatory Spirit, and the good management, which the republican party at Boston have so remarkably manifested on this occasion, and am not a little amused with the anti-climax of address and temper with which the *Wise Men of the East*, have contrived to put themselves in a minority, at a place where they have for several years had majorities of two to one, for whatever and whomsoever they pleased. It has given me great pleasure to see the influence of your personal exertions in this affair, and I had already recognized your hand in the two pieces in the Patriot, and Chronicle before you sent them to me. The Editors of that paper have not many such Correspondents, and ought to be sensible of it. The decorum and moderation, the recurrence to sound principles and at the same time to popular topics of persuasion, in the neat, and easy Style, so well suited to the temper of the times, and to Newspaper discussion, are not very common in the "five hundred daily Newspapers" that our good-natured Countrymen are content to read. The view of parties has already been transplanted at least into one other Newspaper. A distinction rare indeed for political speculations written merely to bear upon a local election. It is succinct, in the main just, and peculiarly suited to produce the proper impression at the time. A Federalist might perhaps insist that with all the extravagances, and intolerances, and absurdities, and almost Treasons of his party, they have nevertheless rendered the most important and durable services to the Common Country — That if at one period they drove headlong to the

¹ Jonathan Mason, 1750-1831. He had held public office on previous occasions. He served as Federalist Representative from Boston, 1817-1820.

dissolution of the Union, they saved it from the assaults of their opponents at another — That the Constitution of the United States, is peculiarly their's — That the Navy and its glories, are in a peculiar sense their's, and that if in the late Stages of the French Revolution, the horror of its excesses, and the terror of its gigantic despotism drove them into a delirium of subserviency to England, the delirium of their antagonists in favour of that same Revolution in its earlier stages, was equally extravagant, and of a tendency not less pernicious. A faithful and impartial, and philosophical history of our *Parties*, from the formation of our Union would be a most valuable and instructive work, and the time is now come when it might be written without danger to the author. Carey's *Olive Branch*¹ is an imperfect attempt at such a work, and is already at its tenth Edition. But one great defect of that Book, is that Carey, born an Irishman, has always been himself in this Country a violent partizan of the democratic party, and that all his acknowledgments of faults on that side are apologies; while all his enumerations of faults on the other side are charges. The essential Spirit of all confession is palliative; that of all accusation is aggravating. Carey's book would be a proof of this, if it were not in proof from almost every thing else. And as to philosophical speculation, reference to the general principles of human Nature, or comparison with the operations of party in other free Nations, or delineations of individual characters, no such thing is to be found in the book. It is an old joke that a good historian ought to have neither religion nor Country; but it is hardly to be expected that an impartial history of a struggle between two parties should be written by an actor in one of them.

I regret very much not having seen the printed vote of the Central Committee to which you allude; but after the secession of two such members as Genl Welles and Major Russell, I can scarcely conceive the blindness of the rest in pushing their Candidate against M^r Mason. This however appears to me clear — That it has *broken their line*, and if the republicans continue their party management in the same Spirit, they cannot fail to have the very next year the Majority in both branches of the Legislature; the selection of the Council; and with regard to the town of Boston, from henceforth the full weight to which they are entitled by their numbers, and by the respectability of character of those whom they recognize as their leaders.

I should think the second of the two plans, suggested by you as likely to be adopted at the next Spring Elections, as in every point of view the best; and particularly since this election of M^r Mason to Congress. First because I trust he will be a very weighty and influential member of the House of Representatives, and should exceedingly regret the loss of his Services there so soon. I have understood that M^r Brooks² serves with some reluctance in the Office of Governor, and would probably not chuse

¹ *The Olive Branch*, by Mathew Carey, a well-known book (1814 and many later editions).

² John Brooks, 1752-1825, governor 1816-1823.

to continue in service long. He could have no better successor than M^r Mason, whose service in the meantime in Congress will I trust be as useful even to the State as it would be in the Governor's Chair. Secondly, I doubt whether the Republicans could split hairs of principle with sufficient accuracy to find a distinction, upon which they could justify themselves in turning out M^r Brooks, to put M^r Mason in his place. If during the late War, M^r Brooks, was in some degree implicated in the misconduct of the Massachusetts State Government, by his official Situation, his Sentiments were undoubtedly the same as those of M^r Mason. His situation may have prevented him from expressing them so freely; but what censure upon the policy of his predecessor could have been stronger, or more keenly felt, than his Silence, concerning it, and the totally different policy that he announced in his first Speech to the Legislature. Nor can I forget that in that very war, he had a son, who died in the Cause of the Country. Thirdly, I think you would still fail in carrying the Election against Brooks. By adopting him they the Republicans would make another and most effectual step towards conciliation, and harmony; and could scarcely fail to carry a majority into both branches of the Legislature. I can scarcely imagine how this should be more difficult to accomplish throughout the State; than it would be for the Republicans to set up another federalist, merely for the sake of displacing Brooks.

Enough upon a subject which as you observe is out of my Sphere. From a Conversation that I have had with the President, I am apprehensive that when Ebeling's Library comes, I shall have it left upon my hands.¹ I should be glad of this if I could afford either the prime cost of it, or a place where it could be safely kept, till I shall have leisure to make suitable use of it myself. But as my means are not adequate to this, I expect to be under the necessity of disposing of the Books or of the greatest part of them, upon the best terms that I can obtain. My determination to purchase them was founded upon the Confidence that I reposed in your brother's judgment, and a feeling of shame that such a Collection, so peculiarly interesting to this Country, in a National point of view, should be lost to it, and scattered over Europe for the want of a few thousand Dollars. But the President is of opinion that 150 Volumes would comprize all the books relating to America, worth having in the Library of Congress, and probably three fourths of them are already there. My deference to his judgment has very much staggered my Confidence in my own, and a little damped the sanguine temper with which I had entered into yours and your brother's feelings. I will yet however not countermand the order which I authorized you to give him for the purchase, but must request you in writing to him, to enjoin upon him, not upon any consideration to exceed the limits which I prescribed in regard to the cost, either by any addition to the sum, or by any deduction from the books. I shall find it hard enough to carry the thing through, as I have undertaken it, but I am still bent upon securing the whole collection to ourselves. Ask your brother also to have the good-

¹ See *post.* pp 114-115.

ness to forward to me as soon as possible, a Catalogue of the Library. I would write to him, but am uncertain where he now is. Can you inform me? I understood it was his intention to pass the next, or rather the present Winter, in England.

I am ever faithfully your's

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

P. S. I give you joy of the opponent that your Letters upon England have found — Such an antagonist is worth ten panegyrics.¹

P. S. 2. Nov^r 25. I have received your Letter of the 20th which was already answered by mine of the 16th. M^r Eustis has got a Secretary, and if there should be any mission to Prussia it will not be sooner than next Summer, and then — how many Candidates!

XII.

ALEX^r H. EVERETT. Esq^r—Boston

WASHINGTON 29. December 1817.

Dear Sir.

Your Letter of the 16th has been a full week upon my unanswered file, and I am now obliged to answer it very imperfectly. The Newspapers mention that M^r Eustis has gone to pass the Winter at Paris, and has left M^r Appleton as Chargé d'Affaires at the Hague. I suppose this is true though we have no notice of it. My last Letter from M^r Eustis, is of 4. October, from the Hague, and its symptoms instead of indicating an intention of speedy departure, rather disclose a willingness to be detained even beyond the period of the ensuing Spring. No necessity for any such detention is supposed here to be likely to arise; but if circumstances should occur to render the homeward voyage inconvenient next Spring, it may perhaps be postponed for another year. I have no particular reason for this surmise, other than that Gentlemen abroad who have projects of returning home do not like to be hurried.

I have not seen the Article upon Peace Societies in the North American Review; nor the Review itself.² But if our Peace Societies should fall into the fashion of corresponding upon the Objects of their Institution with foreign Emperors and Kings, they may at some future day find themselves under the necessity of corresponding with Attorney Generals and Grand and Petit Juries at home. Philip of Macedon

¹ Answers to Everett's articles appeared in the *Boston Daily Advertiser*. They were reprinted in the *Boston Weekly Messenger* beginning November 20, 1817.

² An article by Everett in the *North American Review*, VI. 25, is a review of *The Friend of Peace*, Nos. 1-8, by Philo Pacificus, one of a series of publications issued by a member of the Peace Society of Massachusetts. That Everett's early inclination to the acceptance and promulgation of peace plans and theories continued in later life may be judged from the article. "What can be more thoroughly and essentially chimerical, absurd, and ridiculous, than the pretence of settling a disputed boundary, or a doubtful passage in Grotius by arranging fifty or a hundred thousand men in two opposing lines, and compelling them to shoot each other down?" *N. Am. Rev.*, VI. 44.

was in very active correspondence with a Peace Society at Athens; and with their co-operation baffled and overpowered all the Eloquence of Demosthenes. Alexander of the Neva, is not so near nor so dangerous a neighbour to us, as Philip was to the Athenians, but I am afraid his love of Peace is of the same character as was that of the Man of Macedon. Absolute Princes, who can dispose of large masses of human force, must naturally in applying them, be aided by all the pacific dispositions that they can find or make among those whom they visit with the exercise of their power. In the intercourse between *Power* and *Weakness*, Peace, in the language of the former, means the submission of the latter to its will. While Alexander, and his Minister of Religious Worship, Prince Galitzin, are corresponding with the Rev.^d Noah Worcester,¹ upon the blessedness of Peace, the venerable founder of the Holy League is sending five or six ships of the line, and several thousand promoters of peace armed with bayonets to Cadiz, and thence to propagate good will to man elsewhere — whether at Algiers, at Constantinople, or at Buenos Ayres we shall be informed hereafter.

The mention of Buenos-Ayres, brings to my mind an Article that I have lately seen in the Boston Patriot, and which I concluded was from your pen. Its tendency was to shew the inexpediency and injustice there would be in our taking side with the South-Americans in their present struggle against Spain. It was an excellent Article, and I should be glad to see the same train of thought further pursued. As for example by a discussion of the question in political morality by what *right* we could take side? and who, in this case of a civil War, has constituted us the *judges*, which of the parties has the righteous Cause? then by an enquiry, what the Cause of the South-Americans is, and whether it really be as their partizans here alledge, the same as our own Cause, in the war of our Revolution? Whether for instance if Buenos-Ayres, has formally offered to accept the Infant Don Carlos as their absolute Monarch, upon condition of being politically Independent of Spain, their cause is the same as ours was? Whether, if Bolivar, being at the head of the Republic of Venezuela, has solemnly proclaimed the absolute and total emancipation of the slaves, the cause of Venezuela is precisely the same as ours was? Whether in short there is any other feature of identity between their Cause and ours, than that they are as we were Colonies fighting for Independence. In our Revolution there were two distinct Stages, in the first of which we contended for our *civil rights*, and in the second for our *political Independence*. The second as we solemnly declared to the world was imposed upon us as a necessity, after every practicable effort had been made in vain to secure the first. In South-America, Civil Rights, if not entirely out of the question, appear to have been equally disregarded and trampled upon by all parties. Buenos Ayres has no Constitution; and its present ruling powers are established

¹ Noah Worcester, 1758-1837, secretary of the Peace Society 1816-1828, is credited not only with editing but with writing most of the *Friend of Peace*, issued periodically, 1815-1818.

only by the arbitrary banishment of their predecessors. Venezuela though it has emancipated all its slaves, has been constantly alternating between an absolute Military Government, a Capitulation to Spanish Authority, and Guerillas black and white, of which every petty chief has acted for purposes of War and Rapine as an Independent Sovereign. There is finally in South-America neither unity of cause, nor unity of effort as there was in our Revolution. Neither was our Revolution disgraced by that buccaneering and piratical Spirit which has lately appeared among the South-Americans, not of their own growth, but I am sorry to say, chiefly from the contamination of their intercourse with us. Their privateers have been for the most part fitted out and officered in our Ports, and manned from the sweepings of our Streets. It was more effectually to organize and promote this patriotic system, that the expeditions to Galveston and Amelia-Island were carried into effect, and that successive gangs of desperadoes Scotch, French, Creoles, and North-Americans, have been constituting the Republic of the Florida's. Yet such is the propensity of our people to sympathize with the South-Americans, that no feeble exertion is now making to rouse a party in this Country against the Government of the Union, and against the President for having issued orders to put down this Nest of freebooters at our doors.

Your preparations for the next Spring Elections in Massachusetts, appear to be judicious, and I hope they will be successful. I neither see or hear anything more of the Brighter Views, nor of Old North than what you tell me; and there is at present not much to be apprehended from the authors of either of them.

We have the prospect of a troublesome Indian War in the South; and its bearings upon our political affairs may be more extensive and important than is expected.

I am, Dear Sir, very sincerely your's

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

XIII.

A. H. EVERETT Esq^r — Boston

WASHINGTON 6. April 1818.

Dear Sir,

I have received your Letter, enclosing the draft upon Baltimore for 900 dollars, which when received shall be applied conformably to your desire. I have also your favour of 31. ult^o. A Letter from your brother, of 23 January at Paris has informed me, that while he was in treaty for the purchase of the Ebeling library for me, with a prospect of obtaining it, though the price demanded for the whole was something beyond the sum that I had limited, he received another order, to purchase it for Harvard University, without limitation of price. He therefore justly considered mine as superseded; as the only object which I could propose to myself was that the possession of the treasures, to this Country should at all Events be secured; while my limited means would neither admit of my keeping them myself, nor of my making a donation of them

to one of our Public Institutions. I rejoice that another person has undertaken to carry into effect, that which I could only have partially accomplished; and most especially that our dear Alma Mater will receive the precious deposit.¹

A joint Resolution of the two Houses of Congress has passed for adjourning on the 20.th of this Month: and they are to meet again on the first Monday of November. The present Session will stand remarkable in the Annals of our Union, for shewing how a Legislature can keep itself employed, when having nothing to do. It has been a Session of breaking ground; more distinguished as a seed-time than as a Harvest. The proposed appropriation for a Minister to Buenos Ayres, has gone the way of other things lost upon Earth — like the purchase of Oil, for Lighthouses in the Western Country.

From the Moment that the Massachusetts Republicans resolved to be in a minority upon the choice of Governor, there could be no hope of an effective Coalition for the choice of Senators. The complexion of the Legislature for the ensuing year, is of more importance to the interests of the Commonwealth, than to those of the Union. Perhaps at the end of the next *political* year, as it is the fashion in this Country to call it, the disposition of parties will be more favourable to harmony and good feelings than it is now.

M^r Eustis by the last accounts we had from him was at Marseilles. His health much improved. He was to return to the Hague in March, and to embark upon his return home in April or May.

Very faithfully yours

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

XIV.

A. H. EVERETT Esq^r. Boston.

WASHINGTON 22. June 1818.

Dear Sir.

When I advised you never to solicit a public office for yourself, I did not mean to preclude you from the exercise of your influence in favour of your friends. It would have given me pleasure if your brother could have received one of the two new Appointments of Appraisers of goods at Boston; and your Letter recommending him was laid before the President. But the appointments were regularly made through the channel of the Treasury Department, and the choices had been fixed upon before your Letter was received.

My advice to you was founded upon the opinion that your talents and services would of themselves operate as a sufficient recommendation of you, for any office which may be a worthy object of your ambition.

¹ In 1818 Colonel Israel Thorndike, of Boston, bought for \$6,500 the American library of Professor Ebeling, of Germany, estimated to contain over thirty-two hundred volumes, besides an extraordinary collection of ten thousand maps. The library was given by the purchaser to Harvard College, and its possession at once put the library of that institution at the head of all libraries in the United States for the illustration of American history." Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History*, I. iii.

When you re-enter the diplomatic career, the opportunity of rendering useful service, will be in your hands. Its judicious improvement will be the best of recommendations.

M^r Eustis was expected at the Hague on the 15th of April, and was to embark shortly afterwards for the United States. His arrival may now be daily expected. I have received a Letter from him, giving the explanations which I had requested of the passages in former Letters of his relating to you, of which you have had notice. They are entirely satisfactory, and honourable to you. It is of course very desirable that if you should meet him on his return home, you should not in any manner give him to understand that you have had notice of his remarks concerning you, which have given you uneasiness. They were on his part quite confidential, and as now appears, written without any unfriendly disposition or intention towards you. It was proper on the prospect of your re-appointment to an important public trust that their full import should be unequivocally ascertained, as they have been to the complete justification of your character.

M^r Campbell¹ is to proceed in the course of a few days to Boston, to embark in the frigate *Guerriere*, for Russia. But the President does not think proper to make the appointment of a *Chargé d'Affaires* to the Netherlands until after the arrival of M^r Eustis in this Country, and it is probable that the frigate will go, not through the channel, but North about.

Since beginning this Letter, I have received one from M^r Eustis, dated, at the Hague 21. April. He was making preparations for his departure, and still expected to embark, about the beginning of May.

I remain, very faithfully your's

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

XV.

A. H. EVERETT. Esq^r Boston.

WASHINGTON 4. Aug^t 1818.

Dear Sir,

I shall in the course of a few days send you a Commission and Instructions as *Chargé d'Affaires* to the Netherlands. I give you this notice that you may be making your preparations for departure without delay. Your Salary will commence from the time of your leaving home to proceed on the Mission. For the whole or any part of the outfit you may draw immediately on the Department of State. Go as directly as possible to the place of your destination, and be very cautious not to absent yourself from it without permission, or unless upon motives of Public Service. And for the last time let me intreat you to observe the most rigorous punctuality with regard to your Accounts.

Faithfully yours

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

(To be continued.)

¹ George W. Campbell, of Tennessee, envoy to Russia 1818-1821.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

A History of All Nations from the Earliest Times. General Editor, JOHN HENRY WRIGHT, LL.D., Professor in Harvard University. Volumes I. and II. (Philadelphia: Lea Brothers and Company, 1905. Pp. xviii, 353; ix, 370).

THE general title-page names as authors of the work Charles M. Andrews, John Fiske, Theodor Flathe, G. F. Hertzberg, F. Justi, J. von Pflugk-Harttung, M. Philippson, Hans Prutz, F. Wells Williams; the general editor is Professor John Henry Wright, of Harvard University. The work consists of twenty-four volumes: five on Antiquity, five on the Middle Ages, ten on the Modern History of the Old World, three on the two Americas, and one an index-volume to the whole. The preface states that Vols. I.-XIX. are a carefully edited translation of the *Allgemeine Weltgeschichte*, slightly condensed, with additions; an additional volume, by American scholars, brings the history of the Old World down to the present century, and three other volumes, by Fiske and Stephens, deal with the Western Hemisphere. The title of Vol. I. is 'Egypt and Western Asia in Antiquity, by F. Justi, Sara Y. Stevenson, and Morris Jastrow;' that of Vol. II. is 'Central and Eastern Asia in Antiquity, by F. Justi, F. W. Williams, M. Jastrow, and A. V. Williams Jackson.' The form is royal octavo. The editor, aided by Mr. G. W. Robinson, has read and revised manuscript and proofs of all the translated volumes, and has prepared analytical tables of contents for all the volumes. The whole is profusely illustrated.

The plan of the work is to give not a collection of monographs on the various nations, but a picture of the social and intellectual progress of the civilized world viewed as a community of peoples; the history is regarded as a drama in which each nation comes on the stage and acts its part at the appropriate time. Thus in Vols. I. and II. we have first the early history of Egypt and Babylonia, then the relations of these nations with each other, with Syria, Assyria and Israel, and later with Persia; India and China, however, stand apart, and of the history of Japan at this time nothing is known. Special attention is paid in these volumes to the results of recent excavations and to art and religion. An excellent introductory chapter on "prehistoric Egypt" is contributed by Mrs. Stevenson, Curator of the Egyptian Section in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania; a brief account is given of the efforts to penetrate into the pre-dynastic period, and the opinion is expressed that

the historical development was continuous, that King Mena (now known to be an historical person), though he represents a new starting-point of organization, was preceded by a long period of civilization, there being no cultural break between him and the time before him. The view, here favored, that the Egyptian language and civilization were not derived from Asia is probably correct. Various reconstruction theories, set forth by Petrie and others, are mentioned; but none of these can be regarded as more than hypotheses to be tested by future discoveries. In the succeeding accounts of Egypt, Babylonia, Syria, Assyria, the Hittites, the Israelites, the early Persians, the Parthians and the Sassanians, the narrative, though compressed, is clear, and historical verity is in general successfully kept apart from conjecture. In the early Hebrew history (down to the middle of the ninth century) there has been substituted for the German original a well-considered statement, in two chapters, by Professor Steenstra of the Cambridge Episcopal Theological School, a careful construction of the Biblical material in the light of sound modern investigation; and he has also contributed a chapter on the history of Hebrew literature, which is at the same time a sketch of the historical development of the Old Testament religion. It were greatly to be desired that the historical method might be employed more strictly in the description of the religions of Egypt and Babylonia, which in this work consist too largely of strings of names without a clear statement of the conditions that brought about successive modification of the cults. The term "esoteric" used of the teaching of the Egyptian priests (I. 44, 50) may be misleading; it does not seem likely that they meant to conceal the higher religious thought from the people, since the hymns containing this thought were accessible to the public. The account of the Zoroastrian religion is good, though it is an exaggeration to say (II. 182) that it was superior to the religions of other ancient peoples. Two chapters, by Professor Williams of Yale, give brief sketches of China and Japan; he is disposed to put the beginnings of Chinese civilization as far back as the year 3000 B. C., though the early history is involved in obscurity. Japanese recognizable history begins, he thinks, hardly earlier than 1500 years ago. These two volumes constitute a much-needed guide in the study of ancient history that both the general reader and the specialist may consult with profit. A few slips are corrected by the editor in footnotes.

C. H. T.

Moderne Geschichtswissenschaft: Fünf Vorträge. Von KARL LAMPRECHT, Professor an der Universität Leipzig. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Hermann Heyfelder, 1905. Pp. 130.)

What is History: Five Lectures on the Modern Science of History. By KARL LAMPRECHT, Professor of History in the University of Leipzig. Translated from the German by E. A. Andrews. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company, 1905. Pp. viii, 227.)

PROFESSOR LAMPRECHT has made his visit to America to lecture at St. Louis and at Columbia University the occasion of publishing the most interesting and most important of his works on historical method. His earlier productions in this field have been introductory in form. To be sure they deal with very fundamental questions of the scientific investigation and interpretation of history, and contain much that is new; but in the main they have been written from the standpoint of destructive criticism, or go to establish a general scientific basis for his distinctly original contributions to historical method. With the ground well cleared, and separated by the Atlantic from polemical environment, Professor Lamprecht could develop his method positively and constructively.

The lectures are before us in two editions, the German original and an English translation. Before considering their subject-matter it will be well to measure the accuracy and success of the translation. Anyone who has worked through Lamprecht's earlier essays on historical method does not need to be told that the difficulties which have confronted the translator are appalling. We have borrowed our historical method from Germany so utterly that an English terminology does not exist. He is confronted at once, for instance, by "Kulturgeschichte". How shall it be translated? "Culture history" is a barbarism, and "history of civilization" with its inheritance of bric-à-brac is an absurdity. What is the translator to do, then, with the indispensable adjective "kulturgeschichtlich",—to say nothing of more difficult terms?

The translation inevitably suffers from such conditions. In spite of them it gives us a rendering which is clear, readable, and reliable for sense, and which is a useful contribution toward an English terminology of the subject. Many inexcusable inaccuracies in detail occur, however. Thus: "because there is a pleasure which consists largely of pain, bitter-sweet feelings; e. g. the sensation of greenish-yellow, etc." (p. 124), is not a satisfactory translation of:—"denn es gibt eine Lust, die mit Unlust gemischt ist, ein Bitter-Süßes z. B. oder die Empfindung eines Grün-Gelben usw." (p. 70). The vacillation in choice of words, which is noticeable here and there, is usually due to the search for an equivalent which does not exist,—as when "Reizsamkeit" is translated "excitability" on p. 101, is given in the original on p. 102, and is translated "sensitivity" on p. 138. The most serious

error is the confusion, several times in the second lecture, of the terms symbolical and typical. These defects are not serious enough, however, to keep anyone from the translation. It will give a clear idea of the principles of Lamprecht's method; for thorough and detailed knowledge we must go,—rather more than usual,—to the original.

The first of the five lectures in the volume,—the one delivered at St. Louis,—begins with the sentence:—"The modern science of history is primarily a social-psychological science",—that is social in distinction to individual. The two schools of history which are thus indicated belong, really, to different stages of intellectual development. From its beginning in the imaginative epic and the realistic genealogy history has progressed with civilization. In the eighteenth century,—in accord with the prevailing mode of thought,—each series of events was considered to be the manifestation of an "idea" which was made effective by great individuals. Later these "ideas" were regarded as transcendental, as in Ranke's works.

Meanwhile, however, social-psychic phenomena were attracting attention. Herder introduced the concept of the "folk soul", and a new interpretation of history arose,—the descriptive history of civilization. This disappeared with the ending of the first period of subjectivism. When subjectivism began to dominate again, about 1870, psychology, economics, ethnology, etc. had established themselves, and with their help, and as a part of the same movement, a new and more penetrating social-psychic interpretation of history appeared, i. e., culture-history. Burckhardt began the analysis of psychic conditions by dividing the Middle Ages from modern times, a division generally recognized by the individualistic school, although, with that inconsistency which constitutes its chief charm for many minds, it generally denies the possibility of a systematic extension of the method. Lamprecht is the first who has worked out logically and applied systematically the principles of the social-psychic method.

The first three Columbia lectures deal with the system of culture-periods, Lamprecht's great contribution to historical method. In the first he gives a sketch of German history in order to describe the characteristics of the periods and the manner of transition from one to another. In the second he treats more fully the present, subjectivistic, period in order to show more clearly the character and mechanism of the transitions and periods. And in the third he makes a general application of the principles which have been brought out in the review of German history.

This description and analysis of the most essential part of the Lamprecht method is the most thorough and at the same time the most concrete that we have. It shows, moreover, a careful reworking of his scheme since it was first applied and some modification in consequence. The period of conventionalism, the later Middle Ages, he now regards as a subordinate transition-period, rather than as a fully independent period, like the preceding typical, or the succeeding individualistic.

Similarly the subjectivistic period is divided into an earlier and a later, which are separated by a reaction.

The underlying principles of these periods may be briefly indicated. In every period there comes, eventually, a time when new stimuli appear, economic, intellectual, etc. No one can escape them, they rule the age with constantly increasing power. The result is a dissociation with the dominant of the existing period, which brings in its train great psychic confusion and even suffering. But gradually men come under the control of a new dominant, and finally a new period, different in quality and breadth, takes the place of the old. The transition and the period are both primarily social-psychic, and the dominant is an active force,—not a passive expression of individual acts. This determines at once the position of the individual. He is dominated by the transition and by the period. Within them he enjoys freedom; but he cannot pass their bounds. An illustration is furnished in the imperfect success of the constant effort of historians to free themselves from the dominant of their time in order to understand the past. The true task of history is to study these periods and their transitions in the important social groups,—especially the nations, the most fundamental of all.

The concluding lecture is devoted to the problem of universal history. Nations are not isolated, they are osmotic, to borrow a term from natural science. The relation may be a specific renaissance of the culture of a past nation, a specific reception of culture from a contemporary nation, or a more truly osmotic interchange from day to day. This foreign culture may furnish stimuli, etc.; but to be effective there must not be too great a difference in the psychic level of the nations concerned. The change of the dominant may thus be helped or hastened from without; but it can really come only from within the nation itself. To trace the culture-relations of nations is the problem of universal history.

The scientific principles of the culture-history method are but those which have given, not alone to natural science, but also to economics, ethnology, the history of art and literature, and the other sciences of man, their great success in the latter part of the nineteenth century. What is history? or, rather, Where is history?

ASA CURRIER TILTON.

The Early History of India from 600 B. C. to the Muhammadan Conquest, including the Invasion of Alexander the Great. By VINCENT A. SMITH, M.A. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1904. Pp. vi, 389.)

In the brief space at my disposal it is difficult to speak in an adequate fashion of the merits of this book. The first point that should be emphasized is, that Mr. Smith is a pioneer and one attempting a task that has frequently been pronounced impossible. The second point is that

he has succeeded in this task, i. e., in establishing with general accuracy for the eighteen centuries indicated in the title a sound framework of dynastic annals, which he rightly considers the first need of India's historical studies. This result is due to the fact that Mr. Smith is unusually well qualified for the work he has undertaken. Indian geography, epigraphy, and numismatics are fields in which he is a prominent worker, while the present book gives proof also of an intimate acquaintance with the notices of India in classic writers and of an evidently careful study of the translations of the Chinese works bearing upon the history of India. This knowledge, combined with a high ideal of the office of the historian, ability in the sifting and criticism of evidence, and finally the power of presenting in remarkably clear and attractive form the fruits of his investigations has led to the production of a work of exceptional merit.

For the student of the literature of India, it gathers the results of epigraphical and numismatic studies (with abundant references to the literature of these subjects) and combines them into a connected whole that supplies the background of political history which the study of literature always needs and the study of Indian literature has lacked. On the other hand the book opens to the general reader a new field of history which, on account of the numerous ties between India and the Occident, and the merits of Mr. Smith's work, should prove both as profitable and as attractive as the study of other branches of ancient history.

The contents of the book may be briefly summarized as follows: In the first chapter, after an explanation of the plan and purpose of the work, Mr. Smith gives a description and valuation of the sources of Indian history. In the second chapter, pp. 22-41, he treats of the dynasties before Alexander, to whose campaign in India the two following chapters, pp. 42-107, are devoted. To the dynasty of the Māuryas, three chapters, pp. 108-174, are given. In the next chapter, pp. 175-193, the author disposes of the three dynasties of the Čuṅgas, Kānvas, and Andhras, while the two following chapters, pp. 194-243, deal with the Indo-Greek, Indo-Parthian and Indo-Scythian dynasties. To the Gupta empire two chapters, pp. 244-281, are given. The thirteenth chapter, pp. 282-302, deals with the reign of Harsa, while the last three chapters of the book, pp. 303-357, are devoted respectively to the medieval kingdoms of the North, the kingdoms of the Deccan, and the kingdoms of the South. For each period chronological tables are given at the close of its treatment, and there are besides appendices dealing with the Age of the Purāṇas, the Chinese pilgrims, the Inscriptions of Aśoka, Aornos and Embolima, the position of Alexander's camp on the Hydaspes, and the extent of the cession of Ariana by Seleukos Nikator.

An important question of method is involved in one of the salient features of the book. In opposition to the general opinion of western scholars, Mr. Smith believes himself justified in accepting as a general principle the dynastic lists of the Purāṇas. This procedure I do not

consider justified by the evidence adduced in their favor, and consequently find the least pleasing portion of the book in the chapter on the Dynasties before Alexander, in which the dependence upon the Puranas is greatest. To my mind the study of this chapter shows how little weakened is the force of the first half of Elphinstone's assertion, that "no date of a public event can be fixed before the invasion of Alexander", while the second half, "no connected relation of the national transactions can be attempted until after the Mahometan conquest," finds at last in the rest of the book a brilliant refutation.

On account of its interest to a wider circle of readers the treatment of Alexander's Indian campaign calls for separate mention. Here the most valuable contribution is the series of comments upon the identification of places mentioned by classic writers. Among these the most important is the convincing argument for the crossing of the Hydaspes at Jihlam. Besides these the brief, clear narrative and a generally sound interpretation of Alexander's political and military motives make the treatment of the subject most satisfactory, while the author's estimate of the effect of this campaign upon India is both sound and timely. The one serious defect in this portion of the work is the description of Koinos's manoeuvre at the battle of the Hydaspes. For lack of space I must refer to Wheeler, *Alexander the Great*, p. 442, for a correct description of the battle, adding that while I am convinced that Arrian's idea of the battle coincided with Wheeler's interpretation, I consider that his account is far from being as clear as both Wheeler and Mr. Smith (whose interpretations are diametrically opposed) maintain, and that it is worth while to cite Polyainos, *Strat.* 4. 3. 22, as showing beyond question that Koinos was on the Greek right.

The typography of the book is generally careful, but some blunders are repeated so often that they cannot be charged to the printer; such are: Akēsines, Hegēmon, and for "India's greatest poet" Kalidāsa, or Kalidāsa. In conclusion one must gratefully mention the numerous and well executed illustrations and maps and the liberal index.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

Greek Thinkers. A History of Ancient Philosophy. By THEODOR GOMPERZ, Professor Emeritus at the University of Vienna. Translated by G. G. Berry. Volumes II. and III. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905. Pp. xii, 397; vii, 386.)

THESE two volumes of the English translation represent only Vol. II. of Professor Gomperz's *Griechische Denker*. They treat of Socrates, the Socratics, and Plato, giving to Plato alone more than four hundred pages, exclusive of the many notes.

The features which characterized the first volume of the work are maintained throughout the second. The author does not attempt a rigorous history of philosophy, but presents a vivid picture of the chief philosophers of Greece in the setting of the life of their age. This pic-

ture is enriched by a wide knowledge of Greek civilization; its literature, science, politics, and religion are all laid under tribute in the execution of the task. At its best, the work is admirable. But there is always danger that an account so delightful and easy to follow will lose sight of the deeper elements in the development of philosophical thought. This limitation, perhaps inherent in the very purpose of the work, determines its place and service in the literature of the history of philosophy. It will admirably serve the purpose of the general reader who is interested in philosophy as an element in the history of human culture. And for the technical student who has mastered some of the more rigorous treatises, it will be useful in completing and vivifying his picture of the great thinkers of Greece.

In the treatment of Socrates it will be noted that Professor Gomperz has emphasized the utilitarian aspect of his ethical thought. "Usefulness or expediency is the guiding star of his thought on political, social and ethical questions" (Vol. I., p. 80). Another point of interest in the discussion of Socrates is the author's summary rejection of Xenophon as an authority for the history of thought. That twenty pages in a book on Greek thinkers should be given to a writer so "poverty-stricken" in reflective power might appear to be a contradiction *in titulo*. But the space devoted to Xenophon is filled with interesting material, and will be justified by most readers, as it is by the author, "in view of the importance attaching to his accounts of the words and the teaching of Socrates" (p. 136).

The central point of interest for students of Greek philosophy will doubtless be the author's interpretation of Plato. His treatment may be described as consisting, in the main, of a series of essays which deal with the chief dialogues. Abandoning as impracticable the task of extracting "a Platonic system from the philosopher's writings", Professor Gomperz has rather sought to describe the progress of Plato's development and to lead the reader to a just estimate of his personality. He recognizes three periods in Plato's literary and philosophical career. The third period is "chronologically the best-authenticated of all". "It may be regarded as definitely established that the *Sophist* and the *Statesman*, the *Timaeus*, *Cratylus*, and *Philebus*, form, together with the *Lysis*, a single group, and that the latest in the series" (p. 290). In this third period Plato is represented as subjecting all his earlier beliefs to searching criticism. "The sceptical utterances of the *Parmenides* are followed, in the *Sophist* and the *Statesman*, by attempts at revision and adaptation. Finally, Plato rescues his dearest possessions from the storms of dialectic, which latter he abandons together with toleration and freedom of thought" (Vol. II., p. 36). The question of the genuineness of the dialogues in which criticism of Plato's earlier views appears, is thus simplified for Professor Gomperz. As the doctrine of ideas had "acquired a kind of objective and historical character for its own author", in dealing with the "friends of the ideas" Plato could

afford "a stroke of humor". Such, in briefest statement possible, is the author's solution of this central problem of Platonic interpretation.

WALTER G. EVERETT.

Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius. By SAMUEL DILL, A.M. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904. Pp. xxii, 639.)

THE author of this important work is already known through his book on Roman society in the last century of the Western Empire as one of those English scholars who are doing so much to bring the ancient world, as Mr. Bryce puts it in the preface to his *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*, into "definite and tangible relations with the modern time." Whether we share Mr. Bryce's opinion that the results of such work may be in a high degree "practically helpful" or not, no one surely can deny the actual interest and contemporary effect of such books as Mr. Tarver's *Tiberius*, Mr. Henderson's *Nero*, Mr. Oman's *Seven Roman Statesmen*, Mr. Greenidge's history of the Roman revolution, and this new book by Professor Dill. "We are very near the ancients," said Mr. Bryce in his preface just mentioned, and if this contemporary effect is more noticeable in recent studies of Roman politics and society than in the field of Greek history, it is evidently because we are, at the stage now reached in the course of human events, so much nearer the Romans than the Greeks. Was it not Bishop Potter who pointed out the resemblance between the typical physiognomy of the successful man of affairs and that of a Roman emperor or proconsul? Has not Professor Munro Smith declared that no one could so well understand the state of things at Rome under the triumvirates or the principate as those who are familiar with such phenomena as the "machine" and the "boss"?

In explaining the scope of this book, Professor Dill, while admitting that there must always be something arbitrary in the choice and isolation of a period of social history for special study, justifies his undertaking by a comparison with the drama, in which "there must be a beginning and an end, although the action can only be ideally severed from what has preceded and what is to follow in actual life". "But as in the case of the drama", he continues, "such a period should possess a certain unity and intensity of moral interest. It should be a crisis and turning point in the life of humanity, a period pregnant with momentous issues, a period in which the old order and the new are contending for mastery, or in which the old is melting into the new. Above all, it should be one in which the great social and spiritual movements are incarnate in some striking personalities, who may give a human interest to dim forces of spiritual evolution." Such an age was that to which this book is devoted, with its strange contrasts of light and shade, its vices and its charities, its great effort for reform of conduct and its passion for a higher spiritual life, in which the author finds

its main distinction. One suspects that perhaps the Antonine age may permanently claim a deeper interest on the part of the ideal impartial observer than our own period of transition.

Professor Dill divides his work into four books. Book I., to which he has given the motto "*Infesta virtutibus tempora*", consists of three chapters, one on "The Aristocracy under the Terror", a gloomy picture, drawn from Seneca and Tacitus, of the arbitrary despotism, from which Rome was freed by the assassination of Domitian; a second, on "The World of the Satirist", in which Juvenal and Martial are allowed to say their worst, subject to an even-handed criticism; and a third on "The Society of the Freedmen", as drawn by Petronius,—those makers of colossal fortunes, who were "entirely of Vespasian's opinion that gold, from any quarter, however unsavoury, 'never smells'" (p. 119) but who were, in Mr. Dill's opinion, the representatives of a movement that was not only inevitable but, on the whole, salutary (p. 102).

A very different set of pictures is offered in Book II., of which the motto is "*Rara temporum felicitas*". In Chapter I. we meet with "The Circle of the Younger Pliny", a society "in which the people are charmingly refined, and perhaps a little too good" (p. 143). Here are to be found, contemporary with the corrupt world of Juvenal, simple, pure homes, pleasure in the charms of country life, devotion to literary pursuits, and never-failing charity. We note in passing that on the evidence of the inscriptions Mr. Dill doubts whether private benefactions under the Antonines were less frequent and generous than in our own day (p. 191). In the chapter on "Municipal Life", he expresses the opinion that "there probably never was a time when the duties of wealth were so powerfully enforced by opinion, or so cheerfully, and even recklessly, performed" (p. 211). It is another feature of Roman life which our countrymen can understand better, perhaps, than the Europeans. The Antonine Carnegie was Herodes Atticus, who distributed aqueducts, race-courses, theatres, and baths, and who used to say that hoarded riches were only a "dead wealth" (p. 232). This chapter of Mr. Dill's on the municipalities is surely the best presentation, in English at least, of the results of the study of the inscriptions in this field; and the like may be said of the following chapter on "The Colleges and Plebeian Life", in which we get a glimpse of the life of the masses, again with the help of the inscriptions almost alone. "Probably no age, not even our own, ever felt a greater craving for some form of social life, wider than the family, and narrower than the state" (p. 267).

Book III. is devoted to the apostles of "the Gospel of Philosophy". Chapter I., on "The Philosophic Director", is chiefly a sympathetic study of Seneca's personality and ethical teachings. Seneca is for Mr. Dill a pagan monk, an idealist who, in spite of his vast fortune and splendid palace, would have been at home with St. Jerome or Thomas a Kempis, whose "apparent inconsistency has condemned him in the eyes of an age which professes to believe in the teaching of the Mount,

and idolises grandiose wealth and power" (p. 295). Chapter II. of this book, on "The Philosophic Missionary", is devoted, in large part, to Dion Chrysostom, Chapter III., on "The Philosophic Theologian", to Plutarch.

Book IV. deals with "The Revival of Paganism". Its first chapter, on "Superstition", is concerned with the influence of astrology, clairvoyance, dreams, and beliefs akin to those which we connect with the name of "Christian Science". Poor Aristides, who believed himself "to have been disordered in every organ, dropsical, asthmatical, dyspeptical, with a tumour of portentous size, and agonising pains which reduced him to the extremity of weakness" (p. 463), spent thirteen years in visiting the seats of sacred healing and following their sensible or their marvellous prescriptions, until he was cured. The Dowie of the age was Alexander of Abonoteichos, who set up a medical oracle, the income of which amounted to the then enormous sum of nearly thirty-five thousand dollars a year. The next chapter, on "Belief in Immortality", begins with Virgil and closes with Plutarch. A third, on "The Old Roman Religion", justifies incidentally the beautiful picture of traditional piety presented by Walter Pater in *Marius the Epicurean*. The concluding chapters of the book are concerned with three of the cults in which the religious needs of the age found satisfaction,—the worship of the Great Mother, the worship of Isis and Serapis, and the religion of Mithra. To explain how far these eastern systems, each with its hope of immortality and its sacramental system, succeeded, and where they failed, is one of the chief purposes which the author has had in view.

It is in this second half of his book, which is devoted to the philosophical and religious tendencies of the age, apart from Christianity, that Mr. Dill's lines run most nearly parallel with the work with which his will most naturally be compared, Friedländer's well known *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, but here as everywhere he walks on his own feet and goes his own way. His references throughout to the literary and epigraphical sources are well-nigh exhaustive and his notes refer constantly to many of the best secondary authorities and monographs. One misses, however, any mention of Liebenam's studies of the municipalities and the gilds, or of Hans von Arnim's very remarkable book on Dion Chrysostom, perhaps the most masterly piece of biographical criticism recently produced in Germany.

It would be undesirable to leave the impression that the book is designed, to any considerable extent, to display the analogies between its period and our own. They do not bulk so large in the book as in this review. It is generally left to the reader to make his own analogies. In one very impressive passage, however, at the close of the chapter on municipal life, the author gives expression to a foreboding which must have come upon every student of Roman life under the emperors. "In looking back", he observes, "we cannot help feeling that over all this scene of kindness and generosity and social goodwill, there broods a

shadow. . . . It is the swiftly stealing shadow of that mysterious eclipse which was to rest on intellect and literature till the end of the Western Empire. It is the burden of all religious philosophy from Seneca to Epictetus, which was one long warning against the perils of a materialised civilisation. The warning of the pagan preacher was little heeded; the lesson was not learnt in time. Is it possible that a loftier spiritual force may find itself equally helpless to avert a strangely similar decline?" How to make such conclusions "practically helpful" might tax all the resources which Mr. Bryce has at his command.

The Early Institutional Life of Japan, a Study in the Reform of 645 A. D. By K. ASAKAWA, Ph.D. (Tokyo: Shueisha; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1903. Pp. 355.)

THIS monograph, prepared in the first instance for the Graduate School of Yale University "as a partial fulfillment of the requirement for a degree", is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the history of early Japan. Indeed, next to Mr. Chamberlain's translation of the *Kojiki* with its invaluable introduction and notes, this volume by Dr. Asakawa is first in importance of works in English upon the period of which it treats.

The history of Japan has two great epochs, for which stand the dates 645 A.D. and 1868 A. D., the first representing the adoption of the Chinese civilization and the second the introduction of modern enlightenment. So alike are the epochs that the first reading of this account of the earlier reformation produces a curious sense of strangeness and acquaintance—as if one saw familiar scenes on a tiny scale, far away through a telescope reversed. Great differences, indeed, there are. In the earlier period there was no feudal system and in the second it was far gone to decay; moreover, in the first the movement while based on Chinese ideas, religious and political, was not hastened by the presence of aggressive and masterful foreigners; in the first, finally, all appears relatively simple and spontaneous, and the end is readily attained while in the second the struggle is complicated and prolonged.

Both centred in the restoration of the emperor to power, and our author clearly sets forth the source of his authority. He was the head of a conquering tribe which won the land by spear and sword, incorporated slowly the conquered people with itself and maintained warfare with the surrounding tribes. The isolated situation of the country and its sparse population permitted the process to go on for generations while there grew up the tradition of a divine commission for the family of the sovereign.

We cannot follow the story as Dr. Asakawa unfolds it, nor can we recommend his account to the merely curious reader. It is a book by a scholar and for scholars. Much of the work is here done for the first time and we are given the processes of history-making, with "textual

criticism and documentary analysis", instead of the smooth flow of a finished narrative. The work is the more valuable, for it is by no means the last word on the important topics of which it treats; in its own words it "is intended primarily for criticism and discussion, and only secondarily for direct information". Yet we are convinced that most of the positions taken will be maintained after the fullest criticism and discussion, while we are given information as direct and trustworthy as the sources at present available permit.

The emperor's power with the theory of the source of his authority, the nature of Shinto, the institutions of ancient Japan (say 500-645 A. D.), the struggle itself, and its results, are the chief topics treated. A long and deeply instructive chapter has to do with the political doctrine of China, a theme strictly pertinent to the main discussion, since the Reform of 645 A. D. was based upon it.

In conclusion we can but express our appreciation of the book by wishing its author a long life in which to give his high powers to the cultivation of this field of research, a field second to none in importance and in difficulty.

GEORGE WILLIAM KNOX.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Essentials in English History. By ALBERT PERRY WALKER, A.M., Master in the English High School, Boston, in consultation with ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, LL.D., Professor of History, Harvard University. (New York: American Book Company, 1905. Pp. xlii, 550.)

THIS new volume in the "Essentials in History" series under the editorship of Professor Hart is in many respects a model text-book of English history. Limiting himself to the presentation of only the more salient facts and features of national development, Mr. Walker has produced a most usable and teachable manual in line with the recommendations of the Committee of Seven's Report and abreast of the most recent scholarship. His practical experience as a high-school teacher has enabled him to arrange his material to the best advantage and to include only such pedagogical helps as will be of direct benefit to the teacher and pupil alike. The book has the further merit of conciseness combined with clearness, and pupils should find no difficulty in covering the five hundred and fifty pages of text in the course of one year. In fact, as the author suggests in his foreword to the teacher, an even more rapid survey might be made and be then followed up by review-work of a topical character.

Mr. Walker's arrangement of his material in the form of thirty-eight brief chapters, classified in groups under topical headings, and with continuously numbered marginal sectional headings, which avoid

breaking up the narrative, is much to be commended. The opening chapter presents the course and conditions of English history and is a clear exposition of the general features of English political and industrial development, of the influence of physical conditions, and of the early races inhabiting the British Isles. Then follows a good, clear account of the Roman occupation, which is succeeded by a series of excellent chapters on the Anglo-Saxon period. Like praise is due the two following groups of chapters entitled "Norman Feudalism" and "Culmination of Feudalism", save that both the early part of the Hundred Years' War and the great rising of 1381 receive somewhat summary treatment at the hands of the author. The weakest part of the whole history is undoubtedly that portion devoted to "The Tudor Monarchy", Chs. XVII.-XX., in which the author seems to lose much of his historical perspective and judgment. Space forbids any detailed criticism of this portion of the work, but in general it may be said that many of the author's generalizations are not borne out by the facts, his treatment of the reigns of Henry VII. and of Edward VI. is entirely too summary, the enclosure movement is not sufficiently emphasized, Ket's rebellion is not mentioned even in the Search Topics, where matters that should be in the text are sometimes found, and in the reviewer's judgment a wrong impression is given of many important persons and episodes. The treatment of the Stuarts and Parliament is much better and the chapters on the modern period from 1688 to the present are admirable, culminating in a really strong and original discussion of "England's Contribution to Civilization" which cannot fail to drive home certain great truths and important facts in connection with representative government and free institutions.

Almost perfect in the matter of arrangement and in regard to pedagogical apparatus, for nothing but praise can be given to the maps, illustrations, and bibliographies, Mr. Walker's book is open to a certain degree of criticism in matters of detail and questions of judgment. The author is inclined to be somewhat dogmatic and sweeping in his statements, especially in the summaries appended to the different chapters and at times seemingly contradicts himself as for example when at the close of Ch. IV. he says in connection with the year 827 that "political institutions . . . now appeared on a scale truly national through the union of these kingdoms under Egbert" and a little further on (p. 71) that under Dunstan "the West Saxon monarchs were led to attempt a policy national rather than local". Again his own account would seem to qualify the statement in regard to the witenagemot (p. 58) that after the union of the kingdoms (827) it "rapidly became a mere agency for the king's will" and support the truer view that the power of the witan varied inversely with the power of the king. In regard to the Anglo-Saxon laws, also, there seems to be a misapprehension as to their scope and character and a tendency to confuse them with the common or "customary" law, whereas they are almost entirely made up of criminal enactments. The Anglo-Saxon boroughs hardly receive

just treatment and in the chapter on "Early English Institutions" there is a rather sudden transition from government and law to religion. In dealing with the Norman Conquest and the feudalization of English institutions Mr. Walker is hardly up to date in his information as is indicated by his views of the granting of fiefs in different parts of the country and his discussion of the manorial system, especially the lord's courts. There is also throughout the volume a lack of emphasis on the personal element and a partial failure to do justice to the individual work and influence of men like Lanfranc, Richard de Lucy, Hubert Walter and other great advisers of royalty, while the early life of Becket and his change of view receive scant attention. In his characterizations of historical personages Mr. Walker is also occasionally unfortunate and shows a tendency to either over-state or under-state the truth. Few would recognize the Earl of Bothwell, whom a contemporary described as "despiteful out of measure, false and untrue as a devil" in the "man of great wealth and influence" referred to on p. 278. Justice is hardly done to Mary Stuart in Scotland and it is doubtful, to say the least, if Elizabeth should get the credit for statesmanship "more clear-brained if not more far-sighted than her ablest ministers". Too favorable a view, indeed, is taken of Elizabeth and too much credit assigned to her. Of mistakes of fact and textual errors there is a noticeable lack, the following being the only ones of importance that have been noted in the course of a careful reading: "gesith" (p. 38) should be translated "companion" as the equivalent of the Latin "comes"; Alfred did not fight "nine pitched battles" with the Danes in the first year of his reign (p. 67) and his military career and efforts, while important, are certainly exaggerated; Leofric and Siward (p. 80) both held large earldoms before Edward the Confessor came to the throne and there is a tendency to confuse Canute's policy in regard to earldoms with that of his predecessors and successors; is it quite safe to explain the title "Bretwalda" (p. 46) as equivalent to "Duke of the Britains"?; the Earl of Manchester, whom Mr. Walker calls General Manchester, and not Oliver Cromwell, was at the head of the Eastern Association (p. 327); in view of the numerous curious survivals of feudal land-tenure in England, particularly of tenure by sergentry, is it safe to say that in 1660 "all land-tenures except freehold and copyhold were abolished"; while "three important acts" against nonconformists are referred to (pp. 357-358) four are actually given; the resignation of the Aberdeen Ministry took place during the course of the Crimean War (p. 503) and not before its outbreak, as Mr. Walker would imply; and the date 1853 (p. 504) should, of course, be 1854; and, finally, how many will agree with the dictum that in the whole field of Victorian art "Burne Jones and Watts stand supreme"? (p. 533).

Taken all in all the merits of Mr. Walker's new history far outweigh its faults and shortcomings and it is sure to commend itself to teachers and pupils. The appendixes containing well selected lists of refer-

ence-books and extracts from all of the more important constitutional documents are of great value and form a useful addition to one of the best text-books of English history yet published.

NORMAN MACLAREN TRENHOLME.

A Short History of Venice. By WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1905. Pp. xiii, 355.)

THERE has been a great deal of moralizing and of argument regarding the history and institutions of Venice, mostly by the fervent advocates and opponents of these institutions, but there has been very little impartial and thorough investigation of the sources of that history. Venice has left elaborate memorials, but they have not been carefully analyzed, and until we have more scholarly criticism we cannot know definitely what the history of the Republic is. Romanin's work, which Mr. Thayer considers an "invaluable quarry", was a great advance upon its predecessors (except perhaps Filiasi for the early period) but its statements are often unreliable. The authoritative history of Venice is yet to be written, and it can hardly be written during the present generation. There is too much preliminary work still to be done.

Let us illustrate by examining Mr. Thayer's first chapter. In this he follows the commonly accepted tradition. Speaking of the alleged founding of the city on March 25, A. D. 421, he says that this date "doubtless refers to an actual event, the sending from Padua of maritime tribunes to govern the settlers on the islands of Rialto". The document on which this story rests is a manifest forgery, which has been long discredited (see Filiasi, V, 173: *Le Origini di Venezia*, Manfrin, 20 and 21), and it is hard to see how the truth of an event of the fifth century can be inferred from a forged document of a much later period. There is no credible evidence that any city was founded at Rialto until centuries after 421.

Equally unfounded is the statement that Attila's invasion in 452 was the occasion of the foundation of an independent Venetian commonwealth. Doubtless when Attila destroyed the cities of the mainland there were many fugitives to the islands, but that these then organized a permanent commonwealth "which never submitted to domination abroad nor suffered a tyrant at home" is utterly unproved. Nay, it is contradicted by the only contemporary and reliable authorities, Cassiodorus and Procopius. During the Ostrogothic domination in Italy Cassiodorus was pretorian prefect at Ravenna and as such he addressed to the "maritime tribunes" of these islands the letter mentioned by Mr. Thayer (p. 9). In this he says: "We have determined in a letter of command already given, that Istria should send to the palace of Ravenna merchandise of wine and oil of which it enjoys this year an unusual abundance, but do you who possess numerous ships in the neighborhood, look out with equal favor of devotion that what it is prepared to deliver you may study to convey with speed. Similar indeed will be the favor of each of the two accomplishments". Cassiodorus uses the same im-

perative in his letter to the Venetian tribunes as to the Istrians, from whom he demands the tribute. In his other letter (22, Bk. 12) he calls Istria a *devoted province*. In his letter to the tribunes he asks them to transport the goods with *equal favor of devotion*. The same word was thus applied to the lagoons and to the subject province of Istria, and it seems idle to contend that it did not include the idea of obedience for the Venetians. It has been said that he speaks in such flattering language as is not consistent with command, but he flatters the Istrians as well, and there is no doubt of *their* subjection.

The lagoon islands were undoubtedly subject to the Ostrogothic kingdom. But that kingdom was soon overthrown by Belisarius; Ravenna was taken and Vitiges sent to Constantinople; then the lagoons with most of the Italian territory passed to the empire of Justinian. Later, the Goths, after Belisarius' departure, recaptured much of the Italian territory but not the lagoon islands, for Procopius tells us (Bk. IV, ch. 24) that "In Venetia few cities remained to the Goths and the places by the sea to the Romans, but the Franks made all the rest subject to themselves". Then Justinian sent Narses to reconquer Italy; he came to the head of the Adriatic with his army but was greatly embarrassed to reach Ravenna, since a strong Gothic army barred the way on the mainland, whereupon one John, a relative of Vitalian, who had great experience there, (see Procopius, Bk. IV., ch. 26) suggested to him "to go with all his army along the coast, the men there being subject to them, as has been said". This they did, passing over the lagoon territory and aided by the barks of the Venetians in crossing the mouths of the rivers, and they reached Ravenna. Thus Procopius explicitly declares that the Venetians were acting as subjects and therefore the beginnings of their independence must be traced to a later period. It is highly probable that the first great chronicler of Venice, John the Deacon (whom Mr. Thayer incorrectly refers to as Sagorninus) is more nearly correct than subsequent historians and that it is to the period following the invasion of the Langobards in 568 that we must trace the origin of the Venetian commonwealth. Attila's invasion led to the foundation of Venice only in the sense that it increased the population of the islands that long afterwards became the Venetian state.

Mr. Thayer says (p. 6) that in 466 representatives met at Grado and chose tribunes or *gastaldi* to govern each community. There seems to be a confusion here between the "tribunes", ancient Roman officials (whose duties, however, had by this time been greatly modified) and the "gastaldi", a word unknown in Italy at that date but borrowed long afterwards from the name of certain Langobard officials (see DuCange; Pabst, *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, II, 442; Hodgkin, VI, 575). Equally unfounded is the statement that Venice was never dependent upon Constantinople. Mr. Thayer himself shows (p. 22) that in the treaty of Aix, Charlemagne acknowledged that the Venetians belonged to the Eastern Empire. Other contestable propositions follow in great number which it is impossible here to examine in detail.

Mr. Thayer's account of the growth of the Venetian state gives us little that is new, and there is a lack of distinction in bringing out the perspective of the great events. The author does not explain as clearly as we should wish how the degenerate Romans who fled to the lagoons became transformed into the brave, energetic, resourceful and masterful Venetians.

His explanation of the machinery by which the oligarchy was established (pp. 100-105) is indefinite. It is not clear how the hereditary principle he speaks of proceeds from the provisions he quotes. Perhaps the best summary of the Venetian constitution is given in the *Quarterly Review* of April, 1886, p. 308, where Mr. Thayer's simile of the pyramid is introduced. But much that is necessary for the understanding of the account has been omitted in this book and the description of the Council of Ten as "the supreme executive branch of the state" (p. 115) or "the Venetian cabinet" (p. 116) is quite misleading. The political activity of that council was called forth (like the dictatorship in Rome) in emergencies and it was not the council itself, but an independent body which determined when its interference was demanded. It does not closely resemble anything in modern governments. The statement (p. 116) that the large number of the Council of Ten made real secrecy impossible reveals rather our own point of view than that of Venice, where that secrecy was on the whole admirably maintained until a later period.

The author following many others attacks the Venetian policy of expansion on the mainland, though he wisely directs his criticism not to the original Italian acquisitions, which were necessary to supply the city and to protect Venetian commerce, but to the more questionable expansion of later years. It is hard to say whether the problem then confronting the Venetians was decided right or wrong. If they had refused to succor Florence and the Visconti had spread over all northern Italy, the end of Venice might have come sooner than it did. Mr. Thayer declares that Venice died from sheer old age. If so, how did her mainland acquisitions lead to her fall?

But it is not fair to judge Mr. Thayer's book solely by these rather microscopic criticisms. He has given us on the whole a much better estimate than those who have made the Republic a mere text for the denunciation of oligarchy. During nearly her whole career Venice was more highly civilized than her neighbors and her people were far happier. Her superior intelligence appears in her sound currency, her national loan and banking system, her admirable provisions regarding her merchant marine (p. 91); her highly developed judiciary; her splendid administration of her colonies and dependencies (pp. 165-208); her ecclesiastical independence; the admirable political education she gave to her own patricians (pp. 223, 224); and her reliance upon expert direction in her affairs. All these things are well set forth, and they justify much of Mr. Thayer's panegyric.

The admirable part of Mr. Thayer's book, however, begins with the

eleventh chapter, which describes the life and art of the Venetian people. His description of Venetian architecture and painting is something unique, and entitles him to the position of an art-critic of the very first order.

Some of the following chapters too are of a high character, particularly the biography of Sarpi. Mr. Thayer concludes that Venice died from old age (pp. 316, 317); that like a species born in one geologic period, it survived into another to which it was not adapted. In one sense this is probably true. Doubtless a nation, like a man, is mortal, but there is no normal number of years for its existence, like the three-score and ten of human life. The Vandal empire in Africa became decrepit in a century while Rome required many centuries to attain even its growth. In another place Mr. Thayer had said very admirably of the creation of Venice (p. 28) "that it put forth the attributes of permanence, which implies not the changelessness of stagnation but adaptability". It is a corollary to this that old age is a condition where the rigidity of ancient custom forbids adaptation to new conditions, so we would like to go a little beyond his diagnosis and find out what it was in Venice that led to this rigidity. The problem is too complicated to be decided by a single guess, but it can safely be said that the oligarchy in failing to prescribe any adequate means for eliminating its own unworthy constituents and for constantly admitting to their places the best and most energetic elements of the lower orders of citizens, failed to provide for an infusion of that fresh blood, which was necessary to keep the state abreast of new conditions. This was at least one cause of the decline. An oligarchy which is itself well-nigh immutable cannot meet the changing requirements of new times.

The first chapters of this history leave much to be desired but the final portion of the book is, on the whole, just, admirable and inspiring.

Studies on Anglo-Saxon Institutions. By H. MUNRO CHADWICK.
(Cambridge: University Press. 1905. Pp. xiv, 422.)

IN his preface to these *Studies* the author notes the fact that philologists usually have an eye for their own field of work only. To Mr. Chadwick, however, this rule does not seem to apply. Though primarily a linguist, he brings to his work, in addition to a thorough knowledge of the Saxon speech, an evident enthusiasm for historic research. His *Studies* is a series of essays dealing with some of the more important problems of institutional history. The first half of the work is devoted to the Old English social system and is principally a discussion of wergelds and kindred topics. This is prefaced by a study of the Anglo-Saxon monetary system in which the author reaches conclusions widely differing from those recently put forth by Mr. Seebohm. The second part is a study of the administrative system, and deals with local government, the national council, the origin of nobility and related matters.

Mr. Chadwick is a firm believer in the absolute authority of the Anglo-Saxon king. The witan formed a council merely, whose advice

the king might disregard at pleasure. Scattered all over the kingdoms were the king's estates, each controlled by a reeve who also exercised authority over the adjacent territory. This was the earliest form of local rule. There existed in those early days a reckoning in hundreds of hides, but these did not become administrative units before the tenth century.

To avoid having to share his authority with his relatives (the kingship may have been the property of the whole royal family), the king might assign them certain parts of the realm to administer. Such was the origin of the shire, at least in Wessex. In Alfred's day each shire had its own earl; but in the tenth century, when the large earldoms were being formed, the shire system declined and the borough (a Danish institution perhaps) took its place. But the burghal system proving burdensome, the shire was revived and a new official, the shire-reeve, was placed in control.

It will be readily seen from what has been cited that, if Mr. Chadwick's views are accepted, large sections of Old English constitutional history will have to be rewritten. There can be no doubt that on many points the author's conclusions are correct. To cite an instance, his argument against the old view of a dual shire-government by sheriff and ealdorman seems quite convincing. He very properly emphasizes the fact that periods and places have had their own peculiar forms of development and must be studied accordingly. He also appreciates the difficulties of terminology and the fact that words are not always bound to one meaning. At times, however, his interpretation of terms seems decidedly forced. It requires more than a plausible conjecture or a faint analogy to convince the reader that *land-egende*, 'land-owning', means possessing five hides, that the Danish *here*, 'host', of the tenth century was a political as well as a military organization, or that *geceosan to cyninge*, 'to choose for king', means merely to swear allegiance to a king.

In his use of documents, especially of doubtful charters, the author is hardly as cautious as we should expect such a painstaking student to be. Too many of his conclusions are based on very little or very questionable evidence; some are probabilities merely. He draws many interesting facts from the burghal, county and tribal hidages; but his belief that the shire at one time was reckoned at twelve thousand hides is scarcely well founded. His suggestion that the high-reeve may have presided over the borough is at best a probability based on the supposition that the borough at one time displaced the shire. In his opinion that the hundred had a Danish origin, he believes he has Steenstrup's support; such, however, is not the case.

But Mr. Chadwick's work is a remarkably suggestive study: new interpretations are proposed and the possibilities of certain neglected materials are clearly indicated. The results go far to show that the Anglo-Saxon field may not be so barren as many have thought.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Magna Carta: A Commentary on the Great Charter of King John, with an Historical Introduction. By WILLIAM SHARP MCKECHNIE. (Glasgow: J. MacLehose and Sons; New York: Macmillan. 1905. Pp. xix, 607.)

WHEN one first opens this book he notes its excellent presswork, the professional position of the author as lecturer on constitutional law and history in the University of Glasgow, the indication in the table of contents of some two hundred pages of "Historical Introduction" and of some three hundred and fifty pages of "Magna Carta: Text, Translation, Commentary", followed by an appendix of documents, select bibliography and list of authorities referred to, index to statutes, and general index. All this promises well and Dr. McKechnie's object as described in the preface is thoroughly laudable, for he recognizes that all previous works on this subject are hopelessly out of date and therefore aims to bring the knowledge gained by modern historical research to bear upon the elucidation of Magna Carta. He attempts this in a style which is dignified, sincere, and readable; and it is evident that he has worked with industry and zeal to produce a commentary worthy of its subject.

A closer examination of his work, however, discloses certain fundamental limitations which will greatly impair its usefulness. In the first place, the book is distinctively a commentary upon Magna Carta made from the point of view of the constitutional lawyer, so that the historical treatment of the influence of Magna Carta closes with the reign of Edward I., although Bémont has correctly written: "*L'histoire de la Grande Charte n'est pas finie avec le règne d'Édouard I^{er}. . .*", and even Dicey, a constitutional lawyer like the author, has pointedly objected to this very tendency.

Next, by failing to examine similar phenomena upon the Continent he has exposed himself to the just reproof of Dicey who wrote: "One reason why the law of the constitution is imperfectly understood is, that we too rarely put it side by side with the constitutional provisions of other countries. Here, as elsewhere, comparison is essential to recognition."

And finally, the third and most serious limitation upon the usefulness of the book is that the author has confined himself almost exclusively to works published in English (or Latin), and has not even noted the important contributions bearing upon his subject which have appeared in America. Apart from Bémont, about half a dozen Continental authors are referred to throughout the work, once or twice apiece, and it looks very much as though even this has been done at second-hand. Articles in the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* bearing directly upon the commentator's work have been entirely passed aside. The result is that Dr. McKechnie can have no firm grasp of his subject, and this is apparent in his book. In discussing the origin of trial by jury he omits mention of Brunner and of Professor Haskins's article (p. 159, n. 1). He

considers the "contract, pact, or private agreement" theory of Magna Carta as making it comparable with an instrument relating to "the hire of a waggon" (p. 126), and doubtfully concludes: "Magna Carta may perhaps be described as a treaty or a contract which enacts or proclaims a number of rules and customs as binding in England, and reduces them to writing in the unsuitable form of a feudal charter granted by King John to the freemen of England and their heirs" (p. 129). When it comes to an estimate of the true value of Magna Carta the author lacks again that clear view of its fundamental importance in preserving the "definite contract-idea of the feudal system" as "the corner-stone of the English limited monarchy" which he could have gained from Professor G. B. Adams's articles. Other fundamental questions, such as the logic of the arrangement of the document (cf. pp. 129-144), receive like unsatisfactory treatment.

The first limitation mentioned could readily be justified by the author though to be deplored by the historical student; the second limitation is both deplorable and unscientific, but might have its excuses; the third limitation is fatal to sound scholarship.

Further mention of the Commentaries may be omitted, except possibly a note upon the frequent use made of Coke and Blackstone; but the appendix, consisting of eight documents, calls for attention. Liebermann's description and collation of the texts of the Coronation Charter of Henry I. is ignored; the Unknown Charter of Liberties is "perhaps" identified with the Schedule of 27 April, 1215, rather than assigned to Prince Louis's expedition in accordance with the preferences of Hubert Hall and Bémont; the definitive edition of Magna Carta of 1225 is omitted. As for the "Select Bibliography and List of Authorities referred to", of the eleven works named especially relating to Magna Carta, B. C. Barrington's "curiosity" (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, V. 387) is one, and as far as the bibliography or index is concerned an unsuspecting reader might suppose it a book to be used, unless perchance he should stumble upon note 3, page 212. Two more of the eleven, Lau and Hantos, are mentioned nowhere else in the book so far as can be discovered. It would be idle to undertake to name the important works that have been omitted from the bibliography. The Index to Statutes contains no explanatory headings, the eight-page Index omits important characters, as e. g., Richard d'Anesty (pp. 309-310).

In conclusion, one feels compelled to state that although for want of something better this work will undoubtedly be consulted, nevertheless taken as a whole it cannot be regarded as of more than mediocre value.

HENRY LEWIN CANNON.

The Story of Ferrara. By ELLA NOYES. Illustrated by Dora Noyes. ["Mediaeval Towns"]. (London: J. M. Dent and Company. 1904. Pp. xiv, 422.)

OF all the Italian cities, over which silence and desolation brood, none has made of death so noble a thing as Ferrara. The respect and

awe inspired by the grassy streets and empty squares possess the present author and account for the pleasant element of sympathy which pervades her book. Following the requirements of the series of which her volume is one, the historical account of Ferrara is supplemented by a detailed description of the city's monuments. This second part, as of least importance, we may dispose of first. It is a piece of work carefully done, and with as much vivacity as is consistent with the profession of authorized guide. Rising above the level and showing evidence of original study, is the chapter on the Ferrarese painters, who comprise a powerful and undeservedly neglected school, rising in Cossa and Dosso to heights of real distinction.

The historical section, embracing the bulkier half of her book, evidently placed the author in a predicament. A history with all the various information which one may reasonably expect under that head, could not easily be crammed within the allotted pages. Consequently she deliberately confined her attention to the ruling house of Este, to the accidents by field and flood of that much agitated family, and to the crown of poets and fair women with which its story is wreathed. Considering that Ferrara as a community of free men had but a meagre history, and further, that no sooner recognized as independent, it surrendered to a tyrant, winning thereby the sorry distinction of leading the way in that disastrous rush of the Italian communes into slavery, it is not difficult to approve, at least up to a certain point, the judgment of the author. Let it be admitted that in La Casa d'Este, that remarkable line of tyrants, who were among the few to legitimize their usurpation, lies the *nodus* of the historian's problem. But from a too rigid adherence to this view have resulted a number of painful omissions. Though eclipsed by the glory of their rulers, there lived in the shadow of the castle the people of Ferrara. They experimented with magistrates, they traded, dug canals, raised crops, in any case lived and died; further, the state prospered, spread toward the Apennines and the sea, was in complicated relations with its two feudal lords, pope and emperor. What, since there can be no question of law, was the practice of succession? A student opening a history of Ferrara may fairly hope to find a little more information on these matters than is afforded by Miss Noyes's volume, and may be led to suspect that the limitation of her interest to personalities is due not entirely to choice, but in part to her inability to do justice to the social, economic, and political forces, which are the real makers of a state's destiny.

Taken for what it is and is alone, a portrait gallery of distinguished men and women, this book has both worth and charm. In that long line of rulers from Azzo and Obizzo, whom Dante saw swimming in the torrent of blood, to decadent Alfonso, persecutor of the unhappy Tasso, a writer with a knack of portrait-painting will find matter enough for his pen. Add the princesses, poets, and painters, and the heaped riches become embarrassing. The author's romantic temperament informs all her presentations, but though one and all show an honest

attempt at an immediate vision of the prince or artist in hand, they leave the impression that she has not been able to free herself from the trammels of tradition. To treat the later Estes, the Ercoles and Alfonsos, other than as the giants with feet of clay which they were, is to fail to grasp political values. It is time too to give a new estimate of Boiardo, Ariosto, and Tasso. Does not Carducci's *Ode to Ferrara* weigh more than all their wares? To conclude, Miss Noyes gives us a readable book and a faithful guide to the city's antiquities, but not a history, in the large sense, admitting us to the council of the fates.

FERDINAND SCHWILL.

Études Critiques sur la Vie de Colomb avant ses Découvertes. Les Origines de sa Famille, Les deux Colombo, ses prétendus Parents, La vraie Date de sa Naissance, Les études et les premières Campagnes qu'il aurait faites, Son Arrivée en Portugal et le Combat Naval de 1476, Son Voyage au Nord, Son Établissement en Portugal, son Mariage, sa Famille Portugaise. Par HENRY VIGNAUD, Premier Secrétaire de l'Ambassade Américaine, Vice-Président de la Société des Américanistes. (Paris: H. Welter. 1905. Pp. 543.)

MR. VIGNAUD is well known by his earlier work on Columbus and Toscanelli, in which he showed that the former was not a correspondent of the latter, and could not have learned from the Florentine astronomer and geographer anything to put him on the lookout for a new world or a passage to the old one of Asia. In the present volume he gives a series of critical studies of successive periods and events in the youth of Columbus, in each of which he disproves one or other of the legends that have made the Columbus of history very unlike the real man. His main thesis is that Columbus told his son Ferdinand and Las Casas the stories made known after his death by that son and by Herrera and Oviedo and later chroniclers. He acquits Washington Irving, whose *Life of Columbus* was published in 1828, and Humboldt and later biographers and writers, of any blame for following these legends, for they had no access to other sources. He does, however, dismiss with short shrift Mr. John Boyd Thacher, who in our own day has written a life of Columbus, with too little reference to the great mass of material made public in the last few years. Mr. Vignaud pays due tribute to the researches of Henry Harrisse, but complains that he had no sense of historical perspective and did not appreciate the value of the facts he had unearthed. To Winsor he pays tribute for his clear historical vision that enabled him to make good use of the work of Harrisse and other students of the Columbian period. It was not until the numerous and important publications, in honor of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America, by Spain and Italy, to celebrate their great hero, revealed a mass of hitherto unknown or inaccessible material, that the theories of Gonzalez de la Rosa and Ruge

and other doubters of the legends of Columbus, could be fully established. Mr. Vignaud does this with exhaustive bibliographical references, and among other things characteristic of his work, gives the legendary and the true pedigree and family tree of Columbus, the former of the Lombard family claimed as ancestors, dating back to 960, the other beginning with the father of Columbus, and ending with the living Duke of Veragua. Mr. Vignaud maintains that Columbus told the stories of his great ancestors, of his noble birth, of his education at the University of Pavia, of his voyages to Iceland and England, of his sea-battles, to his son and Las Casas, that they might embody these statements in their accounts of his life and achievements, and thus justify his claims to high office and other marks of distinction from the Spanish king, and this they did in the works that have embodied these legends in history. Mr. Vignaud undertakes to show that Columbus was born in 1451, in Genoa, son of a silk-weaver, of a family which belonged to that gild, and that all his little education was obtained at a school maintained by that gild for the children of its members in Pavia Street in Genoa; that he never was a student at the University of Pavia, that the little he knew of Latin, geography, astronomy and kindred sciences, he acquired in Portugal, that his only sea-voyages were trading excursions to islands near Genoa, until he started for England and some northern ports, in a merchantman that was attacked at sea, driven back to Portugal, then started afresh and touched at Bristol and Galway, but never reached Iceland; returning to Portugal, he settled and married and had a son and lived there until he went to Spain. Of his later and greater life, Mr. Vignaud proposes to tell the real story in a future volume. He pays tribute to the qualities that made Columbus great, his boldness, daring, spirit of adventure, energy, tenacity, strong will, but points to the high authority of Humboldt for the want of technical knowledge on the part of Columbus, his blunders and mistakes in scientific matters that were in his day matters of common knowledge, taught at every good school, and to which Columbus made pretence in vain. He shows that much real knowledge of facts, in spite of want of method, is supplied in the Spanish publications in honor of Columbus, on the fourth centennial of 1492, and much useful information opened to the world for the first time in the great work issued by the Italian government in 1892-1894, containing facsimiles of all the autograph writings of Columbus still extant, and, of still more value and importance, one hundred and thirty-eight authentic documents from the archives of the notaries of Genoa and Savona, between 1428 and 1578, all relating to Columbus and his family, with a critical memoir and a genealogical tree, of the best kind and of absolute verity. He points out the discrepancies in the dates assigned to the birth of Columbus, 1435 or 1436, 1441 or 1447, and in the places claimed for it, and that neither Columbus nor his son Ferdinand, his chosen and designated biographer, ever give date or place, both of which must have been known to them. He shows that at the age of

twenty-one, when it is claimed that he commanded a ship for King René, he was still a weaver, helping his father keep a little tavern, that he did not go to Portugal in 1474, but in 1476, that many of the facts stated by his son and by Las Casas and Herrera and Oviedo, were invented by Columbus, to be used in bolstering up his claim to hereditary greatness. Only in our own day the *History* of Las Casas was printed for the first time by the Academy of History of Madrid, and while Ferdinand Columbus and Herrera drew most of their material from it, there are incongruities suggesting that Columbus varied in his story and tried to improve it at each retelling, yet made positive statements that are at variance with contemporary documents only lately published. It is not necessary to accept all of Mr. Vignaud's hypotheses and inferences, but it is impossible not to admire and respect his bibliographical fulness, his exact references, his painful search after the truth, and his faith in the value and importance of modern canons of historical criticism. To solve the doubts as to the time and place of birth of Columbus, he gives references to over a hundred volumes, from the contemporary sources, Navarrete, Ferdinand Columbus, Las Casas, to the monumental work of the Italian scholars, with its wealth of original materials, to works specially devoted to the question of the date and place of the birth of Columbus, and then the authorities for each of the dates claimed from 1434 to 1456. Mr. Vignaud has dedicated his book to Professor Alcée Fortier of Tulane University, New Orleans,—a grateful tribute to a scholarly historian, and to their common mother state, Louisiana. He promises further volumes on the later years and greater deeds of Columbus, so that we may yet hope to know all the truth as he sees it. Until his work is completed, it is too soon to criticize his reasoning, but even in this first part, he shows a desire to get at the truth. How far his method may be found the best for his purpose can only be decided when he gives the world his whole story of the real Columbus.

Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

By GEORGE UNWIN. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1904. Pp. viii, 277.)

UNWIN announces as the chief purpose of his book the bridging of the chasm that separates medieval from modern industrial history, the discovery of the links between the guild and the trade-union. There is here a certain external similarity with the subject of Brentano's brilliant essay of 1870 on the history of guilds and the origin of trade-unionism. There is an added resemblance in the gift for generalization possessed by the two writers; both dwell upon analogies and parallels rather than upon distinctions and differences, and in both, therefore, the predilection for the comparative method is marked. But on the special theme in question, Unwin goes farther than his forerunner, in the amount of evidence adduced and in his conclusions. Brentano, it will be remembered, expressly denied any direct connection between the

trade-union and the craft-gild or even the journeymen-fraternities, and asserted that the modern organization of labor was the successor of the older form only in so far as both had arisen in periods of stress to meet the aggressions of a class economically dominant. Unwin, however, while recognizing that the descendants of the craft-gild comprise many diverse elements in modern economic life, does not hesitate to draw up a pedigree in which the trade-union is directly affiliated with the medieval gild.

This affiliation is traced in the earlier period from the printed sources, but there is some use of manuscript material and less resort to Continental parallels in the sections dealing with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The course of development follows no straight line, but is devious, involving shiftings, amalgamations and divisions of economic interests and social classes. From the later fourteenth century onward, the growth of capital, of the trading element and of monopolistic exclusiveness in the gilds, which depressed the economic and social position of the poorer industrial members, rendered the status of master constantly more inaccessible to the journeyman, with a consequent growth of journeyman-organization and class-feeling. Ashley saw in the yeomanry of the London gilds a journeyman-association; the Webbs, using the same evidence, pointed out the existence within the yeomanry of a number of masters and traders. Both views, according to Unwin, are correct. The yeomanry was originally composed of journeymen alone, but the development of the domestic form of industry tended to bring increasing numbers of the depressed small masters and of the journeymen under similar conditions of employment and to the same economic level. It was natural, therefore, that both classes coalesced and sought to use their combined strength against the aggressions of the merchant employers dominating the gild. In the yeomanry organization of the Elizabethan livery company, the small masters, recruited from the submerged masters of the gild and from the more energetic of the journeymen, had become the leaders of the rank and file of the journeymen members. It is in the efforts toward independent association on the part of this newly amalgamated class that Unwin finds the chief link between the gild and the trade-union. The favorable opportunity offered by the fiscal necessities and the interested encouragement of the Stuart government was utilized by some of the small-master-journeyman combinations to secure independence through separate incorporation. A little later, under the impulse of the democratic movement of the Commonwealth, others of these associations in the older companies unsuccessfully demanded their "primitive rights" of participation in the control of the company, at least in so far as to elect the wardens of their own yeomanry. But with this outburst, the attempts of the associated small masters and journeymen to constitute themselves an independent organization within the framework of the obsolescent industrial order came practically to an end. Though the associations already incorporated attempted to safeguard their economic position by

joint-stock industrial experiments, their privileges had fallen into the hands of speculative capitalists. And the few feeble petitions for incorporation after the Restoration came to nothing. The tide was already setting in another direction, toward the formation of new industrial classes out of the elements temporarily associated. This is exemplified in the yeomanry of the Clothworkers' Company which had split, on the one side, into a class of larger employers, the forerunners of the modern captains of industry, on the other into the mass of journeymen without capital who by the end of the seventeenth century were initiating that permanent organization of wage-earners which later developed into the trade-union.

In the course of the discussion of his principal theme, Unwin touches suggestively a number of other related topics. Following the lead of Ashley and Mrs. Green, he holds that the struggle of the craftsmen with the merchant oligarchy of the medieval town was not lacking in England, but he adds that this conflict between industrial and trading capital was prevented from finding a constitutional expression, analogous to the political rise of the craft-gild in many Continental towns, by the readiness of the English town-oligarchy to absorb the successful members of the handicrafts. The later antagonism of interests within the towns and between town and country, in the Tudor period, concurrently with that projection of the older town-monopoly on a wider scale which followed the expansion of commerce and the enlargement of the economic area, is viewed at a new angle, by applying the conception, above mentioned, of the conflict of industrial and trading capital. In this connection, however, it may well be questioned whether the sixteenth century, as Unwin asserts, "brought to completion" the national economy. And the suggestion may be ventured that the idea of the "conflict of trading and industrial capital" may easily be overworked. This formula, so frequently employed in the book, is convenient and doubtless often true, but the fact which Unwin himself incidentally mentions, that the functions of the trading and of the industrial capitalists down to a comparatively late date were frequently combined in the same individual, should have served as a more efficient check to the fascinating flow of generalization.

An interesting chapter is devoted to protectionism under James I. Unwin opposes the widely held opinion that England owed her start in international competition to the successful adoption of an energetic mercantilist policy of protection, intimately associated with the development of monopoly. On the contrary, the attempt of the Stuarts to uphold a strongly protectionist régime broke down under the pressure for internal freedom of trade. The ultimate triumph of free trade in England was but the logical outcome of the movement toward commercial freedom, tacitly disregarding or expressly abrogating statutory restrictions, which was initiated by the Parliament of 1624. This view seems to be suggested by Unwin as a subject for further investigation rather

than as the matured result of research; he brings, at any rate, little evidence in support of his position.

Deficiency of evidence, however, becomes of more moment when associated with the chief thesis of the work, the pedigree of the trade-union. This thesis is defended with acuteness and vigor and illustrated with knowledge both of the English sources and of German and French industrial history, but it is unfortunate that at vital points of the argument inference takes the place of fact. The central position as to the relations of classes within the Elizabethan yeomanry rests almost entirely upon the interpretation of exiguous entries from the records of one London company, the Clothworkers. Again, for his assertion of the continuity of development from the journeyman-organization of the seventeenth to the trade-union of the nineteenth century, Unwin adduces but one instance, that of the London hatters. And at the critical period there is here a sad gap in the evidence. From the time of the journeymen's wage-disputes at the close of the seventeenth to the emergence of the hatters' union in the latter part of the eighteenth century there is a total absence of information as to the organization of the workmen. The continuity is only an assumption; it is not as yet a certainty. It may prove impossible to obtain full and satisfactory evidence of the plausible hypotheses which Unwin advances, but it is to be hoped that the study so auspiciously begun may be further prosecuted, preferably by Unwin himself, and that he may extend his researches in the archives of the London companies beyond the two he has already explored.

But aside from the necessary criticism called forth in part by the inadequacy of the evidence, in part by the defects of the author's own excellent qualities, there is much to praise in this, Unwin's first book. In temper and spirit it is admirable. The presentation is in general clear, though the mazes of detail he has explored might well have bewildered a guide of less competence and verve. With all due respect to the work which has prepared the way and with full recognition of the work still to be done, of the questions still to be answered,—questions which it is part of Unwin's service to have assisted in formulating,—his essay must be regarded, in my opinion, as one of the most stimulating contributions of recent years to English economic history.

EDWIN F. GAY.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by the late Lord ACTON, LL.D.; edited by A. W. WARD, Litt.D., G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., STANLEY LEATHES, M.A. Volume III., *The Wars of Religion.* (London and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905. Pp. xxvi, 914.)

THE field covered by the present installment of this monumental work does not exactly correspond to the idea conveyed by its title. It stops short of the last and greatest of the "Wars of Religion", the Thirty Years' War, which is reserved for consideration in a later vol-

umic; yet on the other hand it passes considerably beyond the natural halting-place afforded by the close of the religious wars in France, the peace of Vervins, and the death of Philip II. in 1598. Its general starting-point (save for the chapters on the Ottoman Power and on Ireland) is indeed, as one would expect, the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis in 1559; but it is impossible to find an equally convenient date to mark its termination, for the story breaks off, if one may be allowed so to express it, at a variety of points all included in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, the precise year in each country being determined by the close of a reign. Thus in England we are brought to the death of James I. in 1625, in France to that of Henry IV. in 1610, in Spain to that of Philip III. in 1621, in the Empire to that of Rudolph II. in 1612 and in the Netherlands to that of Maurice of Nassau in 1625. The result of this arrangement is that the present volume has considerably less unity in itself than any of its predecessors, and much less than the fifth volume of Lavis and Rambaud's *Histoire Générale*, which is entitled *Guerres de Religion*, and covers the entire period from 1559 to 1648. The exigencies of space are doubtless largely responsible for the limits that have been chosen; but even as it stands the present volume is somewhat bulkier than those which have appeared before, and it is an open question whether the editors would not have done better to reserve those chapters which deal with the first quarter of the seventeenth century for an introduction to the Thirty Years' War. It must also be remarked in this connection that it is a matter of great surprise to find a chapter on "the Height of the Ottoman Power," which we naturally associate, as does its author, with the reign of Solymán the Magnificent, 1520-1566, inserted in a volume the rest of which deals chiefly with the period 1560 to 1625, when the Turks were notoriously on the decline.

The same distinguishing features which have characterized the earlier volumes of the *Cambridge Modern History* have been preserved also in the present. The object which the great majority of the collaborators have constantly sought, and for the most part successfully attained, is compressed accuracy, the piling up of many facts without too much regard to digestibility of presentation. In some few cases, notably the chapters on the Netherlands, by Rev. G. Edmundson, compactness is combined with a style and manner of narration which makes reading attractive as well as instructive; these chapters, in fact, are likely to be among the very most useful of the whole book, since before their appearance there was no satisfactory scientific and impartial account in English of the period with which they deal, save for Miss Ruth Putnam's translation of the earlier volumes of Professor Blok's *Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Volk*. Occasionally too we come to a chapter which offers a welcome respite from the overcrowded pages of the bulk of the work. Such, especially, is the very brilliant, though relatively overlengthy essay by Count Ugo Balzani on Rome under Sixtus V. The author gives us a novel and very illuminating view

of this pontiff, whom he regards as one of those strong personalities who "sum up the tendencies of the time and stamp them with their own character". Count Balzani's description of Sixtus' complicated and important dealings with France during the crucial years 1588 to 1590 is particularly valuable, while his local knowledge of Rome has enabled him to give us a most delightful picture of the city as it was in the time of Sixtus, and of the changes wrought in it by him.

Several other chapters call for special mention. Rev. J. Neville Figgis's "Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century" bristles with learning and throws into clear relief the effects of the development of Protestantism on the growth of royal power. Mr. R. A. Dunlop has made the history of Ireland under the Tudors considerably less dreary than does Bagwell; his field is very difficult and he has had distinct success in dealing with it. To Mr. Edward Armstrong we are indebted for a sane and thorough estimate of the work of the much neglected Cosimo de' Medici and Philibert Emmanuel of Savoy. Mr. Sidney Lee's "Last Years of Elizabeth" is not what its title implies, a summary of the history of England from 1588 to 1603, but rather a résumé of the internal affairs of the entire reign; it is none the less welcome for that reason, however, and bears every evidence of having been written by a thorough master of the period. It would be almost impertinent to add that the latter statement holds doubly true concerning the late Professor Gardiner's chapter on "Britain under James I."; it contains the quintessence of those vast stores of ripened learning, which a life of unrelenting industry and zeal enabled the author to acquire.

The length of some of the chapters and paragraphs is somewhat disproportionate to the importance of the matters of which they treat. The Empire from 1555 to 1576 is certainly not worth forty-two pages if France from 1562 to 1593 is dismissed in fifty-two. Nor are Tuscany and Savoy in the second half of the sixteenth century worth thirty-nine pages, when the other independent Italian states and Spanish dependencies in Italy are left practically untouched, and Spain itself gets but fifty-one. Shakespeare surely deserves more than two pages if Montaigne has four, Cervantes more than twelve lines if Henri Estienne has thirty. And there are some rather startling omissions. There is, for example, no account of the great siege of Antwerp in 1584-1585. We look in vain throughout the volume for a clear statement of the important though not familiar fact that Franche Comté shared the lot of the Belgic provinces in 1598 in being handed over to the Archdukes. Major Hume gives no hint of the terms on which Philip II. was accepted in 1581 as King of Portugal, nor of the changes in the constitution of Aragon after the Perez episode in 1593. Some account of the political and ecclesiastical organization of the Huguenots from Mr. A. J. Butler would have been very welcome. After the limitations announced in the preface to the first installment of this work, we are

surprised to find that the present volume contains no less than three chapters exclusively devoted to literature; but this makes all the more striking the absence of any adequate account of the development of painting, sculpture and science in this period.

There are moreover a considerable number of misprints and minor errors. "Murder of Henry II." should be "Murder of Henry III." in the headline of page 47. Dr. Brosch's use of the title "Solyman II." to indicate Solyman the Magnificent is not according to the best usage; it should be Solyman I. (The Solyman who conquered Gallipoli in 1356 died before his father Orkhan and was therefore not a real sultan, while the Solyman who disputed the throne with Mohammed I. is always reckoned as a mere pretender.) If Professor Laughton persists in his contention that the English fleet never got further than Ushant on the quest for the Armada detained at Corunna, he should show cause for the rejection of Mr. Corbett's assertion that it crossed the Bay of Biscay and nearly reached the coast of Spain. Henry II. of France did not die in June, 1559, as Major Hume asserts (p. 483) but in July. When the preamble of the edict of Nantes expressly states that it is "perpetual and irrevocable", it is very surprising to find Mr. Leathes announcing that it "bears the stamp of a temporary measure" (p. 676). The death of the Duke of Anjou occurred in 1584 and not in 1585 as Mr. Figgis has it (p. 764). It is perhaps unfair to criticize the spelling of proper names, but one certainly has a right to demand uniformity. But we find "Jagiello" on page 73 and "Jagello" on page 170, "Ruy Gomes" on page 190 and "Ruy Gomez" on page 241, "Medina Coeli" on page 234, and "Medina Celi" on page 486. Most extraordinary of all, we are expected to recognize the commander of the Turkish left at Lepanto under the names of "Ochiali Pasha" on page 135 and "Luch Ali" on page 497.

The bibliographies in this as in the preceding volumes are likely to be the most useful portion of the work. They have evidently been compiled in most cases with extreme care and industry, and those which deal with the more remote countries where historical study is still in a somewhat backward state will doubtless prove indispensable to students of all nationalities. Yet on the other hand they show the danger of trusting to any list of books that is not practically complete. Even allowing for the limitations which the editors have announced it would be difficult to justify the omission of such well-known monographs as Willert's *Henry of Navarre*, Méaly's *Origines des Idées Politiques Libérales en France*, Schäfer's *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Spanischen Protestantismus* and Gounon-Loubens' *Essai sur L'Administration de la Castille au Seizième Siècle*. In fact it must be confessed that the bibliography for Chapters XV. and XVI. reveals a great lack of knowledge of the recent mass of French and German works on Spanish history. Worst of all is the absence of any reference to the late Professor Seeley's *Growth of British Policy*, which contains by all odds the most illuminating and suggestive account of England's foreign affairs in

this period that now exists; and the omission is particularly inexplicable in a Cambridge Modern History.

Despite all these minor defects, however, there can be no doubt that the third volume of this great work is in every way worthy of the high standard set by the earlier ones. The period it covers is exceptionally complicated and difficult—with a multitude of isolated details and a paucity of central events about which to group them, while the mass of polemical writings by Catholic and Protestant has served to obscure rather than to illuminate the truth. Over all these difficulties the editors of the *Cambridge Modern History* have gained a decisive victory. They have furnished us with a general guide to a most perplexing epoch, the value of which is unrivalled by that of any other work save possibly the fifth volume of Lavissee and Rambaud's *Histoire Générale*. Comparisons between these two great collaborate histories have been so often made that it is happily unnecessary for the present reviewer to add another, but they certainly differ so widely in conception, arrangement and execution that there is no danger that either will ever render the other superfluous.

ROGER BIGELOW MERRIMAN.

Scotland in the Time of Queen Mary. By P. HUME BROWN, LL.D.
(London: Methuen and Company, 1904. Pp. xi, 243.)

THESE six lectures before the Scottish Society of Antiquaries describe the physical, social and economic aspects of Scotland during a period second to none in its contributions to national development. The work is not exhaustive—the author purposely omits biographical, religious and political topics, and does not mention legal procedure or purely intellectual developments—but within the limits selected the book contains the most adequate description with which the reviewer is acquainted of the conditions of Scottish life in the sixteenth century. By the constant employment of the comparative method, conditions which Scotland enjoys in common with England and the Continent are described, differentiations noted, and so far as may be, accounted for. The value of the work lies rather in the *ensemble* than in novelty of detail; while its remarkable lucidity, precision and vigor of exposition make it a notable addition to Scottish historical literature.

The first two lectures—based largely upon travellers' accounts—treat chiefly of the physical aspects of Scotland, intercommunication, and the external appearance of villages and towns. The next three lectures deal with subjects of supreme importance—the various phases of town-life. The drift of population from country to town had already begun, and at this time, according to Professor Brown, the towns contained perhaps one-half of the total population. There the most intense life of the nation was concentrated; they were the main agents in effecting the change in the national religion; the power of the nobility was soon to wane before their power, and it was chiefly in the towns that those symptoms of economic change were manifested “which mark the reign

of Mary as a period of transition from the Middle Age to the modern time". The third lecture describes the *mise en scène* of this activity: the extent and character of town-property; communal rights and how they were used; the functions of the church-yard and the cross, the tol-booth and the tron. Lecture IV. discusses the fundamental conditions which determined the form of municipal organization and burghal rights, describes the various sources of income, and exhibits with remarkable vividness the actual processes by which public utilities were converted into means of payment of town-obligations and the conditions thereby established under which home and foreign trade existed. Noteworthy is Professor Brown's publication *in extenso* of a document of 1614 which contains a "precise enumeration of all exports and imports with the respective values of each" and thus affords a complete view both of the industries and of the foreign trade of the country. The fifth lecture deals with a subject second in importance, as a feature of Mary's reign, to the religious revolution only—the rivalry between the merchants and the craftsmen. This controversy of a century's duration now reached an acute stage and involved the question of town-control at the very time when the towns were becoming the determining factor in national life. The chapter is one of remarkable lucidity and force, exhibiting the dynamics of the question in a manner unexcelled.

The last lecture discusses the extent to which Scotland participated in those movements which resulted in the establishment of modern life in England and on the Continent. Nowhere was the religious breach more complete than in Scotland; economic change, however, was less rapid and radical than elsewhere—largely because Scotland had a smaller volume of trade and commerce, and was consequently less under the pressure of necessity. This was true of the transition from a municipal to a national basis in trade and commerce; of the destruction of the power of the gilds and liberation of industry; and of the poor laws. Yet to a limited extent Scotland shared the great European tendencies to social and economic change, and presents the spectacle of a nation awake to improved foreign methods, but of resources too limited for their complete adoption.

O. H. RICHARDSON.

A History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation. By ANDREW LANG. Vol. III. (London: Blackwood and Son; New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 1904. Pp. xi, 424.)

IN the course of his exposition of Scottish history Mr. Lang has reached the great crisis of the seventeenth century, and to this he devotes the whole of his third volume. The period, beginning with the accession of Charles I. and closing with the recognition of William and Mary, has a manifest unity, for it saw the trial and failure of two momentous experiments. On the one hand and on the other it was attempted to govern Scotland by a divinely sanctioned monarchy (in the sense understood by the Stuarts) and by a theocracy managed by the

covenanted Kirk. The army's treatment of Charles I. at Newcastle and Cromwell's treatment of the army at Dunbar, mark the inadequacy of both systems. Mr. Lang has provided what he has accustomed us to expect from him, an account of a troubled period that is clear and interesting, informed with humor and never without that seriousness which underlies all true humor. But if the present volume maintains the standard of excellence set by its predecessors it does not escape the shortcomings that characterized them. We have had occasion before to comment on Mr. Lang's neglect of constitutional matters and *Kulturgeschichte* and we shall only remark in passing that in this respect the present volume is open to the same objections as the earlier ones.

The historian who deals with seventeenth-century Scotland undertakes a task of peculiar difficulty, for although his authorities are abundant they are very insufficiently criticized; the partisanship of the time has scarcely abated to-day and most modern writers have only darkened counsel by words. Scottish historians, it would seem, do not command the services of such Gibeonites as the perpetually recruited seminarium places at the disposal of a Continental professor, and have not themselves hitherto been content to hew wood and draw water in a purely disinterested spirit. These remarks may be illustrated by a reference to the problem stated and discussed in the footnote on p. 158.

Again, although Mr. Lang shows a grasp of actuality that can only be the result of a careful interpretation and combination of his authorities, he is not uniformly successful in his exposition. His style, broken and jerky in general, is often marred by the crudest transitions and at times sinks to the level of the annalist (e. g., p. 85). The proportion is occasionally obscured and the connection of events lost sight of, by the inclusion of details which although interesting are unrelated. The disposition of the material and the general structure of the volume are, on the other hand, excellent; and some of the characterizations—notably those of the two Argylls, Montrose and Archbishop Sharp—are altogether vital and admirable.

One enquires naturally, with some eagerness, in what spirit has Mr. Lang, Scot as he is, approached the most troubled time of his national history? He has hitherto made no secret of his purpose to say the utmost that could be said for the losing side. In his second volume he positively cherished his sympathy with the old religion, not, we fancy, from any great liking for the theological and political systems associated with it, but rather on account of its misfortunes. Now he has spoken his mind on the Covenant in particular and the Kirk in general, in terms that can only be qualified as moderate in comparison with those commonly used in the seventeenth century. The Covenant was a "band", with all the sanguinary associations of such documents, and of all these it was the bloodiest; the whole affair was the most mischievous of ignorant anachronisms (pp. 30-32). After Montrose's failure the preachers were urging reprisals: "more blood must be shed to propitiate the Deity. This is the theology of Anahuac or Ashanti; an insatiate God calls for

human victims; thus the fanatics read the Gospel" (p. 162). When in 1650 Charles II. was being badgered into signing "an infamous paper", reflecting on his father and mother, Mr. Lang comments thus: "apparently Charles was to conciliate Jehovah by breaking the Fifth Commandment" (p. 234). Few people nowadays will consider this language too strong in view of the circumstances. Still there is much to be understood—and something to be said—on the other side. The dilemma proposed by Mr. Lang is not quite a fair one. The Scots objected to the king's interfering in the smallest measure with the freedom of their consciences but required him to do violence to those of his English subjects, and to his own, by establishing Presbyterianism south of the Border. That is no doubt the logic of the situation, but to state it so, is to neglect the fact that the Kirk honestly believed itself to be in direct relation with the Deity and therefore infallible. "A fevered dream of theologians" (p. 163), if you like, but none the less sincere and imperative. Mr. Lang, of course, understands all this better than most people, and he has his reasons for the course he has followed. In this country, however, where Scottish history is not perhaps popular and where Mr. Lang unquestionably is so, he risks overshooting his mark. Any one who wishes to redress the balance of his own judgment on these matters and to learn how necessary in certain quarters was such a presentation of the subject as Mr. Lang has furnished, may consult a small work which has recently appeared in Edinburgh under the title, *Scotland and Presbyterianism Vindicated*. The author, a Mr. Wauliss, amiably remarks that Mr. Lang is an anglicized Scot who "has attacked in a most atrocious way the national creed of Scotland, and has also attempted to vilify her national honour in a manner worthy of an Old Bailey barrister". We cannot imagine a better justification for the course Mr. Lang has adopted. The case is a very special one, and heroic measures are needed to dispel illusions of a certain order. But the policy has its dangers and it is still a sound principle that error should not be met by error in the hope that two opposing wrongs will check and correct one another. Mr. Lang has not always escaped the dangers to which he has thus exposed himself. Take, for example, the passage in which he describes Leighton's resignation in 1674 (p. 328); it is too long unfortunately to quote here, but one sentence will indicate its tone. "Christianity sufficed for him; the differences of the churches, from that of Rome to that of Knox, were to him futilities". This view commends itself to most reasonable men to-day, but we are not thereby dispensed from appreciating—and appreciating sympathetically if possible—the constraining force of that belief in an infallible and exclusive church which was held at Geneva as at Rome.

Mr. Lang rejects (p. 103) Gardiner's opinion that the domination of the preachers improved the morals of Scottish society, and brings a good deal of evidence to show that "the rude peasants" and others continued "to wallow in impurity" during the seventeenth century (the phrases are Gardiner's). If there was any improvement it was

due, he thinks, to English policing rather than to Scottish preaching. This must have been hard reading for Mr. Wauliss and his friends. Some years ago Mr. Mathieson expressed the same view in his *Religion and Politics in Scotland*, and we suggested in a review of that work,¹ that it was not difficult to produce evidence of that kind for almost any country or any period, and that the moral calibre of a community should surely be judged as much from what it thinks it ought to do as from what it does. The question is a delicate one and a discussion of it would be inappropriate in this place.

The curious will be interested in the excursions in which Mr. Lang discusses the question of Charles II. and the death of Montrose and the case of John Brown of Priesthill, the Christian carrier who was shot by order of Claverhouse in 1685, and they may perhaps regret that he "has not thought it necessary to enter more fully into the particulars" of the riot at St. Giles in 1637. Professor Hume Brown, it will be remembered, committed Jenny Geddes to the limbo of myth, and Mr. Lang seems disposed to agree with him (p. 26).

The volume is well produced and the only slips we have noticed are few and unimportant. A good reproduction of Honthorst's portrait of Montrose serves (appropriately enough as those of Mr. Lang's mind will think) as a frontispiece.

GAILLARD THOMAS LAPSLEY.

Thomas Harrison, Regicide and Major-General. By C. H. SIMPKINSON, M.A. (London: J. M. Dent and Company; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1905. Pp. xv, 304.)

It would be interesting to know what induced the publishers of the Temple Biographies to include in their list Thomas Harrison. It is impossible to make out of him a popular subject. Moreover, the facts in his life are too little known to make it possible to write a successful popular biography. Consequently, it would be better to have attempted a life based strictly upon thorough research. The writer seems to have felt that this was true, and has frequently quoted authorities, and sometimes referred to them, though in such cases he has timidly given nothing but a general reference, as for instance, *Somers Tracts*, or "Pamphlet in the British Museum". Such references are well-nigh valueless, and in the case of pamphlets in the British Museum they are positively ridiculous.

It would be interesting in the second place to be informed in respect to the motives which impelled a biographer of Laud to undertake a life of Harrison. It is the mode to-day in writing history to parade a complete impartiality, but here the display of impartiality is almost monstrous and seems to do violence to human nature. After reading the book, one longs for an hour of Samuel Johnson and appreciates what he meant when he said that he loved a good hater.

Mr. Simpson is not a good hater; nor yet a good biographer. The known facts about Harrison are few, and have almost all been given

¹ AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VIII. 750-752.

to the public by Professor Firth. To these Mr. Simpkinson adds little, and since the whole is hardly sufficient to fill up the space at his disposal, he seems to have felt compelled to pad by giving a history of the times. Worse still, he is not master of this material, and so gives it to the reader almost in its raw state. A good half of his book consists of quotations, and long quotations. Thus in one chapter, after some brief extracts, he gives eight pages from Thurloe, followed immediately by a half-page from Roger Williams, which in turn is succeeded by almost as long an extract from the *Clarendon Papers*, after which comes a passage from Ludlow, which is then followed by a five-page letter from Thurloe to Monk, which is almost immediately succeeded by two more pages from Ludlow. This is not the way to write history. It is all the more to be regretted, since if Mr. Simpkinson had given his time and attention to a presentation of the beliefs, purposes and status of the Fifth-Monarchy men he would have had sufficient material to fill the space and would have been presenting matter which was germane and indeed essential to his subject. He, of course, gives us some information on these heads, but in a fragmentary and imperfect fashion.

What is said above sufficiently indicates his method of writing history; his ability goes but little beyond his method. His quotations are inexact; he is not discriminating in his use of authorities; his evidence occasionally fails to bear out the assertions based upon it; and his judgment is not sound, for he goes so far as to say that "there is good authority for considering" Harrison "to have possessed at one time even greater power in the army than Oliver Cromwell". The most valuable part of the book is the Appendix, containing the nineteen extant letters of Harrison. These have all been printed before.

John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount of Dundee, 1648-1689. By CHARLES SANFORD TERRY. (London: Archibald Constable and Company. 1905. Pp. viii, 377.)

SOME fifteen years ago the anonymous author of *The Despot's Champion* wrote in her preface that the career of Claverhouse "has given rise to controversy quite out of proportion to its historical importance". And, relatively speaking, the professional soldier employed to suppress conventicles in the south-western counties, or even the heroic leader of a cause doomed to failure from the start does not loom very large among the countless persons and problems which crowd the pages of British history. Nevertheless, the representations of credulous and partisan martyrologists and the fame of *Old Mortality* and *Bonnie Dundee* have perpetuated in Claverhouse a figure grewsome and romantic. As a traditional bogey leagued with the devil, and as an heroic successor of Montrose, he continues to live.

Although Claverhouse found a defender nearly two centuries ago in the Jacobite *Memoirs of 1714*, his notable vindication first appeared in Mark Napier's three-volume work (1859-1862); since then he has

figured as one of Mr. Andrew Lang's "English Worthies" in a brief volume by Mr. Mowbray Morris (1887). *Clavers: The Despot's Champion*, by "A Southern," another defense, appeared in 1889; but it is professedly little more than a rearrangement of Napier's material. Mr. Henderson's careful article in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, while it corrected some previous errors of detail, is naturally hardly more than an outline of facts. Finally, Mr. Terry, an acknowledged authority on the period, having noted shortcomings and imperfections in the preceding works, thinks the time has come to tell the story again, and submits his work to the public in the hope that he has been able "to present a rounder and more complete picture of Claverhouse than has hitherto been available, and to dissipate the appalling number of errors which for very lack of careful probing, have come to be accepted as unchallengeable facts in the record of his career." Much may be said in favor of the undertaking. New sources of material have been opened of late, and, moreover, Napier overlooked or misinterpreted much that was accessible to him. Furthermore, apart from faults of temper and arrangement which characterize his great work, it is far too bulky for any but the special student.

Strictly observing the injunction *ne sutor ultra crepidam*, the present author makes no effort to use his subject for a treatise on the "causes and significance" of the revolution of 1689, though he aims to connect Claverhouse with the policy he was appointed to carry out and to contribute somewhat to the military history of the Restoration and post-Restoration in Scotland.

While the general impression of Claverhouse that the reader will take away from these pages will perhaps not differ greatly from the sensible estimate of Mr. Mowbray Morris, it will naturally rest on surer grounds; since here he has been privileged to enter the courtroom, to have the vast and complicated mass of evidence laid before him, and to see it examined with great honesty and acumen. While it is, no doubt, the apogee of the microscopic method to devote a careful enquiry to prove that Claverhouse was shot in the left eye and not in the body, future historians will reap the fruit of many of these painstaking studies. More than one popular error is blasted, as for example, Claverhouse's importance at the battle of Bothwell Bridge, and his insubordination in pursuing the rebels against Monmouth's orders. After a re-reading of Mackay's narrative in the light of a personal examination of the ground Mr. Terry has been able to fix a new and, it would seem, more exact site for the battle of Killiecrankie.

By keenly dissecting the stories of Claverhouse's alleged atrocities he furnishes ampler and more convincing proof than ever before of their exaggeration. His conclusion deserves quoting.

"It appears then," he says, "that the number of lives taken by Claverhouse in a period of the severest political crisis was precisely ten. In the case of eight of these ten Claverhouse stands exonerated, either by the circumstances of their condemnation, or by the circumstances under

which they met their death, from the charge of arbitrary, cold-blooded, or vindictive blood-letting. Two cases alone stand, in which, upon his own initiative, Claverhouse exacted the death-penalty. In one of them absolutely, in the second of them with almost equal certainty, Claverhouse was no more than the agent in the carrying out of a sentence to which its victims were legally and knowably liable. The traditional Claverhouse of Wodrow, Howie, Defoe, and their unquestioning modern disciple Macaulay, is familiar. 'Murdered by Bloody Clavers' is the conventional epitaph of rebel martyrs in whose death he had no particle of share. 'Bloody' in disposition he was not. 'Bloody' in execution he was not. Of the refinement of cruelty which condemned the Wigton martyrs to a lingering death there is in Claverhouse not a trace. The conclusion is insistent, that had he died plain John Graham of Claverhouse, and not Viscount of Dundee, the one availing personality in Scotland in militant sympathy with the discredited policy of a Despot whose Champion he was, 'Bloody' Clavers had never been created to confound 'Bonnie' Dundee, and the tombstones of the murdered martyrs had been purer for lack of the conventional libel of him."

Although Mr. Terry scathingly condemns those who originated these legends and those who accept them (see, e. g., pp. 201-203), he is no special pleader against the Kirk and the Whigs, and makes no attempt to place Claverhouse in a fairer light than the facts warrant. What he shows us is a man austere, unflinching in performance of his duty, and effective just because he believed implicitly in the policy he was employed to execute. At times, particularly as Sheriff of Wigton, he was even inclined to mildness; but only when he thought it paid; thereby "showing a nice discrimination in the economy of punitive effort."

Owing to the prevailingly minute discussion of details and the formidable array of evidence cited the book promises to be hard sledding for the general reader. Here and there, however, attractive bits are offered, notably the accounts of Claverhouse's courtships of Helen Graham and Jean Cochrane. He failed in his first venture, although after beginning his suit from purely interested motives he finally became so enamored as to offer to take the lady "in her smoak." His second wooing was successful, but those were stirring times when the bridegroom had to leave his wedding festivities to ride down a suspected conventicle.

There seem to be few statements of fact or opinion to which one can take exception. "Three centuries" (p. 1) should obviously be two, the statement (p. 100) that Argyle refused to take the Test is not strictly accurate: he offered to take it in a modified form. The "monotonously opportune Protestant wind" (p. 237) only came after William of Orange had already been seriously repulsed by the elements. Finally, the attempt to prove that Dundee, after the expulsion of James, kept to the letter his promise to William "to live quietly unless he were forced" is not altogether convincing. The text is illustrated by two portraits of Claverhouse and one of his wife. The sketch-map of Dundee's campaign of April-July 1689 is of great assistance in following his move-

ments; but the careful map to illustrate the site of Killiecrankie could have been made more useful by marking on it the positions of the troops engaged. Three appendices discuss the history of Claverhouse's regiment, his death at Killiecrankie, and his alleged letter to James announcing his victory.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

Mirabeau and the French Revolution. By CHARLES F. WARWICK.
(Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1905. Pp. 483.)

THE publication of this volume was due to an afterthought. The author began to write "with the intention of preparing a course of lectures", but later "decided to put the material gathered into book form". The second thought was not a happy one, for whatever merit the work may have possessed as a course of lectures it is neither a satisfactory biography of Mirabeau nor a clear, sound and well connected synthesis of the early Revolution.

An account of Mirabeau and the French Revolution in less than five hundred pages can be, even at its best, little else than a masterly sketch, more or less popular in character, but it need not be, for that reason, unscientific, meaning by this that it need not everywhere betray the ignorance of the writer concerning the results of recent investigations touching Mirabeau and the Revolution. It is reasonable to expect, then, that the author of such a volume as this, before beginning to write, should acquaint himself with the best literature on the subject. As far as I can judge from the text—there are no foot-notes—the knowledge of Mr. Warwick concerning what has been written upon Mirabeau is inadequate. It is not to be expected that the writer of a work of this description will familiarize himself with the sources, but he should at least have read all the important monographs that alone can supply him with a sound basis of fact. Here and there, somewhat capriciously and often, it would seem, at second hand, the sources are quoted. Some use, how much I cannot tell, has been made of the classical work of Louis and Charles de Loménie. The reference made to the life of Mirabeau by Professor Stern is of such a character that one might be pardoned for doubting if Mr. Warwick had ever read it. Of the writings of Guibal, Leloir, Joly, Cottin, Dauphin Meunier, Welschinger, Wild, Raynal, Deerne, Gradnauer, and the excellent short biographies by Mezières and Rousse I recall no mention, but the volume abounds in citations from Carlyle, Guizot, Alison, McCarthy, Von Holst, Willert and—Watson. Such dependence upon outgrown or popular or semi-popular literature, such lack of discrimination in associating, for example, Von Holst and Willert with Watson, such ignorance of the latest and best monographic works might reasonably give rise to doubts as to the soundness of the narrative.

And such doubts have a solid foundation. The same lack of critical spirit that marks the bibliographical work is encountered also in the attitude of the author toward the evidence. His inaccuracies are numer-

ous and he appears decidedly helpless in the face of contradictory statements. At times, inaccuracy could have been avoided only through a knowledge of the sources, but for the most part an acquaintance with the best monographs or even a more careful study of Loménie or Stern would have saved Mr. Warwick many a fall. Such extreme blundering as that found on page 107, where it is stated that the *Compte Rendu* of Necker "showed an enormous deficit," followed by the observation on the next page that "this showing was made by Necker to induce capital to take the loans of the state," is exceptional, but there are many other inaccuracies quite as inexcusable.

The constructive portion is no more successful than the critical. In the first place, there is too much polemic, too much of personal impressions and feelings and too little history. The historian is supposed to tell us "Wie es eigentlich gewesen," and when he gets so heated as to exclaim—on paper—"The wretched liar," speaking of the Duc d'Orléans, or to refer to the Marquis de Mirabeau familiarly as "this old ruffian" or the "conceited old pedant," the thought arises that such a writer might not be a safe interpreter of the evidence. In the second place, the volume lacks proportion and unity. It deals with "Mirabeau and the French Revolution," that is, with the influence of Mirabeau on the Revolution and of the Revolution on Mirabeau, not with "Mirabeau and with the French Revolution." There is, however, so at least it seems to me, too much of this last conception of the subject in Mr. Warwick's book. One hundred and twenty-four pages out of a total of four hundred and sixty-seven certainly form an excessive number to allot to the ancient régime before introducing Mirabeau. The matter is interesting enough, but there is too much of it that has no direct bearing on the subject. Then again the synthesis of the Revolution is not well thought out, there is no large grasp of the subject, there is lack of continuity and at times failure to understand the meaning of the facts, while in the biography of Mirabeau some very important periods—that from 1783 to 1787, for example—barely receive a passing notice.

The illustrations of the volume—with a few exceptions—have no historic value and some of them verge on the ridiculous (see pp. 122 and 342). The facsimile of a document (p. 438), supposed to be in the handwriting of Mirabeau, is, with the exception of the signature, the work of a copyist.

FRED MORROW FLING.

Le Grand-Duché de Berg (1806-1813). Étude sur la Domination Française en Allemagne sous Napoléon I^{er}. Par CHARLES SCHMIDT, Docteur ès Lettres, Archiviste aux Archives Nationales. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1905. Pp. xvi, 528.)

THE three states which Napoleon created in Germany and which disappeared with him, Berg, Westphalia, and Frankfort, have now received adequate, scientific treatment. Thimme's *Das Kurfürstenthum Hann-*

over and Darmstaedter's *Das Grossherzogthum Frankfurt* are recent evidences of the interest German scholars are taking in the "French period" of their history. But the third state has never hitherto been sufficiently investigated. Rambaud and Denis have treated its history in a very limited manner. Fisher in his *Napoleonic Statesmanship* has given fifty pages to it, admittedly based upon only a partial examination of the sources. The need of a thorough investigation of this field has been completely met by Mr. Schmidt in a study, remarkable for its amplitude, its solidity, and its precision. Relegating Beugnot's *Memoirs*, written long after the event, and very impressionistic, to a subordinate position, he has built up in a masterly manner an authoritative monograph upon an important subject.

To his text he has prefixed a bibliography of the unpublished sources used, indicating the precise importance for his work of each of the various archives of Paris, Düsseldorf, Münster, Wiesbaden, and Berlin, as well as of the private archives of several French families important in connection with the history of Berg.

The method of treatment is topical, not narrative. The first two chapters are devoted to the reign of Murat, the rest to the history of the Grand Duchy as administered directly by Napoleon.

The territory out of which this petty state was created had previously belonged to fifteen different sovereigns. Much diversity of institutional life prevailed in the different parts. Mr. Schmidt describes at length and with clearness the political and social transformations effected by the French tending toward unity and toward social equality—the unity being brought about by the introduction of the French governmental machinery and by the common military service, the equality by the abolition of feudal institutions, the introduction of the Code, the French judicial system and the French ideas in regard to church and school. One gets a vivid impression from this account of the amount of time and intelligent study devoted by French administrators to the problem of pouring new wine into old bottles.

There was no hasty assertion of doctrinairism, no sudden and unintelligent imposition of Parisian novelties upon an alien people. Unhappy delays were even sometimes caused by the scrupulous care of the authorities in Paris to study questions thoroughly before reaching decisions. Moreover Germans were preferred for most of the offices in the state. Much that was introduced by the French failed to strike root, not because of its unfitness, but because of the short duration of the French rule. Yet twenty years would have been enough to acclimatize the new institutions and in 1809 Napoleon was justified in looking forward twenty years.

A large and illuminating section of this book is devoted to the economic influence of France upon Berg. Mr. Schmidt traces the evolution of the protectionist policy of France from the tariff of 1791 down to the disastrous tariff of Trianon, 1810. The deeper significance of these tariffs is shown, they being apparently inevitable measures required

by France in her painful transition from an agricultural to an industrial state of society. He shows Napoleon no free agent in his economic policy but profoundly compelled by clamorous French protectionists ever urging higher duties by arguments now sufficiently familiar. The effect of this system was ruinous to Berg, a state even at that time the most completely industrial on the Continent, a "miniature England" as it was justly called by contemporaries, the present centre of Germany's great industrial power along the Rhine. This state, absolutely dependent upon foreign markets, found them everywhere closed by Napoleon. The Bergois earnestly and persistently sought annexation to the French Empire, that thus they might share its markets. Instantly all the amenities of the struggle for existence were glaringly displayed. German manufacturers of the left bank of the Rhine protested vehemently against admitting German manufacturers of the right bank, painting the inevitable ruin that the new competition would bring upon French industries.

The gifts of the gods are mixed. The French gave enlightened political, legal and social institutions to the right bank and by a fatality which they could not master crushed this region by an economic policy that ruined rich and poor, that closed hundreds of factories and turned the high altars of churches into receptacles for the precarious commodities of smugglers. It was a strange paradox that that German state most directly controlled by France was the one that suffered most. Berg alone of all the countries of Europe drew no benefit from the Continental System.

Mr. Schmidt's book is, in short, a model of monographic writing, a rich contribution to historical knowledge. It will henceforth be indispensable for the student of Napoleonic Germany.

There are several appendices unusually informing, a chart showing the regions composing the Grand Duchy and containing a variety of statistical data, a contemporary map, and critical notes on the memoirs of Beugnot hitherto considered so important. A similarly severe appraisal of other autobiographic values of this period would be of the highest service to historical students.

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

Madame Récamier et ses Amis. Thèse présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris, par ÉDOUARD HERRIOT. (Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1904. Two volumes, pp. lxxiv, 357, 438.)

Two difficulties confront the writer attempting to deal with the history of Madame Récamier. In the first place the very complexity of her life makes the task no easy one. As M. Herriot points out in his introduction, it may be going too far to say that Abbaye-aux-Bois was a second Versailles and that the circle there over which Madame Récamier presided holds as important a place in the literary history of France as does Port Royal in its religious history, still it is true that the

whole history of the half-century from 1800 to 1850 may be summarized in the life of this woman who during those fifty years exercised an important influence politically as well as intellectually and socially. To make a vivid picture of Madame Récamier involves therefore not the presentation of an individual portrait, but of a group, and a group so arranged that one figure shall stand out in the foreground.

The second difficulty arises from the subtlety of Madame Récamier's influence. Unlike her friend Madame de Staël she did not herself write but inspired others to literary effort, nor was her influence forceful and direct, but indirect and intangible. According to one of her admirers neither the pen nor the brush could adequately represent the graceful charm of her power; it could be represented only by music.

His own inability to meet this second difficulty M. Herriot frankly recognizes and for a delicate and really successful appreciation modestly refers his readers to Sainte-Beuve. What he does propose to do is to write a detailed and impartial history of the facts of Madame Récamier's life. For such an attempt there is ample room, since previous accounts were either written with a distinct bias, such for instance as Madame Lenormant's, or else deal with Madame Récamier only incidentally. But M. Herriot while realizing the impossibility of treating her apart from her contemporaries, proceeds to make her not a subordinate but the central figure of the group. Beginning with her childhood and early training, he traces her growing influence from its dawn under the Directory to its meridian under the Restoration and develops with elaborate care her relations to her endless series of lovers and admirers, naturally with special emphasis on Madame de Staël, Benjamin Constant and Chateaubriand. His judgment is on the whole decidedly favorable. Like Sainte-Beuve he gives full credit to her virtue and finds her ruling motive not in heedless ambition for power but in an eager and constant if sometimes thoughtless desire to give pleasure.

The treatment of the subject well accords with the title—*Madame Récamier et ses Amis*, but the reader can not help wishing that the friends were not made so prominent, in other words that M. Herriot had not drawn with quite such scrupulous attention to detail the minor figures of the picture.

The form of the book would be better moreover and the impression more vivid if the author had relegated to foot-notes some of the matter presented in the text, but the amount of hitherto unpublished material included and the elaborately annotated bibliography make the work a mine of information and an indispensable basis for any further study of Madame Récamier.

ELOISE ELLERY.

A History of Modern England. By HERBERT PAUL. Vol. III. (London and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905. Pp. 454.)

THE third volume of Mr. Paul's history begins with the ministerial changes on the death of Lord Palmerston late in 1865 and ends with the

Parliamentary session of 1876 when the Ministry of all the Opportunities, otherwise that of Mr. Disraeli, was at the height of its power. It is a busy and important decade, the Continental upheavals of the Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian wars, the unification of Italy and Germany, the fall of the French Empire and the rise of the French Republic finding their complement in English affairs in that great period of reform which at once elevated and exhausted the new Liberalism during the early years of Mr. Gladstone's ascendancy. The tone and scope of Mr. Paul's work have already been discussed in these pages and the third volume of the series confirms the impression made by the first two. This is primarily a Parliamentary or political history of England, with such attention to legal, literary and religious movements, and such reference to foreign affairs as serve to illuminate the main theme. On the whole, matters become of importance to the author when they rise above the political horizon, and too often not till then. Even so, as we have already noted, there is still a striking absence of many social and economic data which we might otherwise expect, which, if not politics as yet, are or have been news, and so have some rights here on that ground if on no other. In the present volume an entire chapter on the Irish Church, another on the Church of England and still another on Theology and Literature, beside much passing comment on such matters elsewhere, shift the balance somewhat from that of the earlier volumes. This is the more true in that the stirring events of this crowded decade abroad give a special chapter to England and the Continent, aside from the main narrative. The Settlement with America traces in much detail and with perhaps too great disproportion of space the negotiations arising from the Alabama Claims. The spirit of fairness in which Mr. Paul's account is written could however ill be spared from the history of that once bitter controversy. Especially does his statement of the case reflect great credit on Mr. Adams. In conclusion, as usual, we have the chapter on Intellectual and Social Progress and the index. For the present volume in particular Mr. Paul has had the advantage of using Morley's *Life of Gladstone* and unusually numerous foot-notes indicate his large indebtedness to it, as well as to Walpole's *History of Twenty-five Years*. In the matter of opinions, so noticeable previously, time or some other agency seems to have somewhat softened the author's earlier rashness. Another volume has not much altered the impression of Napoleon III.'s "crooked mind and shallow heart," even in those last bitter days when he was "little more than a grey shadow, once a man, or at least a nephew." Of the other principal actors in that French tragedy Mr. Paul ascribes much credit or discredit to the Empress as well as to Gramont for the war. At the same time he holds up Thiers as, at least by implication, the principal figure standing between the new Republic and "reactionary Royalism" on the one hand and "intriguing Imperialism" on the other, a judgment which is, at least, open to question. For Bismarck, he has apparently much respect, if no great admiration for his ethical qualities. "For complete and absolute cynicism his proceedings at this time [the

Barritz interview] are not surpassed even in his own career," though he is given credit for a clearer head and sounder mind than his French rival. And finally, not to prolong this matter, it is interesting to note the expression here of an opinion concerning Russia which, greatly helped by recent events in the East, is gradually making its way in the world, especially in England. It is that the reputation of Russian diplomacy for unscrupulous craft and abnormal subtlety derives little support from historic fact. This is, at least, healthier than its Russophobic rival.

It will be time to sum up this considerable achievement when the end is reached. But we may note that Mr. Paul's vigor seems unimpaired thus far, that his courage seems tempered somewhat more by discretion, and his politics diluted with somewhat more of those matters which find little place in Parliamentary debate or *Times* editorial. And if, in the long list of liberal achievements which fill the great reform period, the narrative tends to take on the character of a Parliamentary Digest, it becomes, thanks to Mr. Paul's clear head and vigorous English, little less interesting and rather more useful for that.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

Cavour. By DOMENICO ZANICHELLI. "Pantheon Series." (Florence: G. Barbèra. 1905. 1p. 427.)

ALTHOUGH Cavour still lacks a monumental biography, he has had several noteworthy books written about him. Beginning with Bonghi's brief sketch and Artoni's introduction, one gets an impression of the importance of the man and of the magnitude of his achievement. Treitschke devoted a solid study, somewhat raspingly Prussian, to him. De Mazade analyzed, with insight and Gallic lucidity, his political career. Countess Martinengo Cesaresco made a model epitome, and William de La Rive in his *Souvenirs* produced one of the finest intimate biographies of modern times. Massari, whose work still remains the standard in Italian, is uncritical and diffuse, but he cannot be ignored, because he furnishes sidelights possible only to a contemporary. Finally, Chiala, in his exhaustive introductions and notes to the six volumes of "Letters", has amassed material of the greatest value. This list does not include Castelli's recollections, nor the various volumes of letters edited by Count Nigra, Baron Mayor and others; nor Berti's invaluable contributions to our knowledge of Cavour before 1848.

With this voluminous material as a basis, Professor Domenico Zanichelli, of the University of Pisa, has erected a solid analytical study of Cavour's work as a state-builder and diplomatist. He first furnishes in detail the principles which inspired Cavour's activity; then he shows how these principles were applied to the regeneration of Piedmont after 1849, how far the force of circumstances bent them, and how subtly in most cases they overcame opposition. Professor Zanichelli analyzes with remarkable clearness the intricate steps by which Cavour attained great results; and this needed to be done anew, for

the world has come to regard the unification of Italy as a matter of course, forgetting the years when its fate hung in the balance and success seemed improbable. In these pages,—so skilfully is the past called on to give testimony—we follow the plot from day to day with almost the suspense of a contemporary.

In very few places will one familiar with the subject differ from Professor Zanichelli's conclusions. He has drawn the general outline with a sure hand. He shows rare insight in divining Cavour's purposes, rare skill in showing Cavour's resourcefulness. Occasionally we should need to go beyond the political record in order to understand the hidden springs of policy—as, for instance, in the case of the rupture between Cavour and Rattazzi—but in the main we find the chain of causation complete.

Professor Zanichelli is perfectly candid. He describes without suppression or distortion the method by which Cavour brought about the *Connubio*, his fast-and-loose play with European diplomacy before the war of 1859 and during Garibaldi's expedition, and his guile toward Francis II. before the collapse of the Bourbon Kingdom. He shows that while it is easy to condemn these or other phases of Cavour's statesmanship as disingenuous, if not immoral, they are to be judged at last by their motive. He holds that the statesman, like the general, cannot be bound by the usual code which rules private life. His duty is to save the state at all costs, even at the cost of deceit. A general might have every reason to believe that the enemy must conquer, but he would not be justified in telling his troops that they must expect to be beaten. Washington did not shrink from deceiving the British as to the strength of his army. Lincoln for a long time made each of the Northern elements which supported the war believe that he was waging the war especially for that element. This doctrine leads, of course, to rank Jesuitry, to the assumption that the end justifies the means. But before other statesmen can excuse their doubtful practices by saying that Cavour or Lincoln was just as bad, they must prove that their country's existence could be assured in no other way. They must recognize, further, that in statecraft as in warfare the standard of what is permissible is slowly rising.

I lay stress on this part of Professor Zanichelli's book because his frankness is most commendable. It relieves him of the suspicion of being a mere eulogist—that suspicion which any biographer of Cavour runs the risk of incurring. Professor Zanichelli has produced the best analytical biography which has seen the light in Italy since Villari's much more pretentious works on Savonarola and Machiavelli. He is "scientific", inductive, thorough, sober. He has not attempted to write the "Life and Times of Cavour", and so he has passed by many episodes and personalities; but he has done well what he undertook. Historical students will regret that the series in which his *Cavour* appears does not permit the use of footnotes or even of reference to the sources

of his many quotations. In this respect he and De Mazade are equally tantalizing.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

Bismarck und seine Welt: Grundlegung einer psychologischen Biographie. Von OSKAR KLEIN-HATTINGEN. Band II. Erster Theil: 1871-1888; Zweiter Theil: 1888-1898. (Berlin: Ferdinand Dümmler, 1903, 1904. Pp. 651, 206.)

KLEIN-HATTINGEN'S first volume, dealing with Bismarck's career down to 1871, was noticed in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, IX, 390, and in that notice the purpose and plan of the work were fully indicated. The present volume deals with the seventeen years during which Bismarck controlled the political development of the empire he had founded, and with the ten years following his forced retirement, in which he worried his successors with open and inspired criticisms, surprised the world with occasional revelations and composed his *Reflections and Reminiscences*. To the historian these years are far less important than the great decade in which German unity was established; to the biographer who, like Klein, is chiefly interested in Bismarck's personality, they afford even more material.

In writing the political history of Germany from 1871 on, Klein's political bias causes him to lose all sense of proportion and even the appearance of objectivity which he maintained in his first volume. The foreign politics of two decades are dismissed in a few pages, and the reconstruction of Prussian local government is barely noticed. The greater part of his second volume is devoted to the conflict of political factions in the German and Prussian diets. The leaders of the Liberal left wing—*Fortschritt* or *Freisinn*—are his heroes; the numerous pages devoted to them are pure panegyric. The leaders of the Liberal right wing, the National Liberals, are pictured as either well-meaning simpletons or hypocrites. Like most Germans, the author is intolerant of political compromise and places *Prinzipientreue* above all the practical political virtues. The Clericals and the Social Democrats are represented as talented and high-minded men, because they are against Bismarck, who rapidly develops into the villain of the parliamentary drama. Like most stage-villains, he is really very shallow, and appears to play the part for its own sake. His conflict with the Roman hierarchy, his persecution of the Social Democrats, his adoption of a protectionist tariff-policy, were all dictated, according to Klein, by antipathy to political and economic liberalism, and were primarily manoeuvres for discrediting and destroying the Liberal party. A reader unacquainted with the independence of the administration in Prussia and in Germany and the subordinate part played by the diets would imagine that these bodies were really parliaments and that the German chancellor and Prussian premier required the support of a majority.

The analysis of Bismarck's personality becomes equally partisan and one-sided. It might have been compiled twenty years ago from the

speeches of Eugene Richter, and it might have appeared in the columns of any radical journal whose editor was willing to go to prison for insulting governmental authorities. Klein grows very hot and scolds: his adjectives are distinctly vituperative. In sum: Bismarck's dominant trait was love of power (*Herrschaft*); patriotism and sense of duty did not exist in him; when he asserted such motives, he was a hypocrite. Love of power destroyed in him all moral instincts: to hold power he would descend not merely to intrigue but to calumny and downright falsehood. He was also extremely vindictive: he pursued even his vanquished opponents with untiring hatred. Without attempting to deny the details of this indictment, it is submitted that the picture is untrue because the shadows are grossly overcharged and the lights unfairly kept down. It is all black or gray.

To a foreigner there is something a little sad about such an attempt to destroy a great national figure. About the best of national idols there is not a little common clay, but hero-worship is after all an important part of a nation's heritage. Of course the historian must tell the truth as he sees it; but he must be sure that his view of the truth is not colored by hatred or by envy—by the feeling that the belittling of the great makes ordinary men, including the historian, seem less little. In the last pages of his book Klein betrays something of remorse: he recalls the lasting achievements of Bismarck's statesmanship, and calls upon his readers to strew upon the great man's grave "flowers, only flowers." But the tributes he has left there are not flower-like.

MUNROE SMITH.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Essentials in American History. By ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.
(New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: The American Book Company. 1905. Pp. xlviii, 584.)

THIS is one of a series of text-books for secondary schools, including a volume each on ancient, medieval and modern, and English history, prepared under the editorship of Professor Hart.

Of late there have appeared some texts which in avoiding the dull chronicling of events have succeeded in creating merely an "atmosphere" filled with elusive generalities. The result was that in the great majority of high-schools, without good libraries and without specialists as teachers, the books were unsuccessful. In this respect the author seems to have struck the desired mean, though the aforesaid smaller high-school will surely find it difficult to cover so large a text within the time usually allowed in the curriculum. The query arises, too, whether it would not be better to omit many details which encumber rather than assist the narrative.

The mechanical arrangement of the book consists of a division into thirty-six chapters grouped under general headings, such as "Revolution", "Federation", etc. It is noticeable that the earlier periods are treated with much more brevity than the later. The somewhat original

grouping of topics in the Colonial period is the book's most distinguishing feature.

The introductory chapter properly lays the foundation of American history in the Renaissance and in the changed condition of European trade in the fifteenth century. The physical geography of America is reviewed in its economic relations. The problem of the native races is well handled and the old "mound-builder" theories are successfully disposed of. This chapter of "Foundations" is among the best in the book.

After the narrative has been brought, under the general head of "Beginnings," to 1607, there follow three chapters continuing the story to 1689, under the general caption "Colonial Englishmen". The first of these deals with the settlement and history, to 1660, of Virginia, Maryland, and the New England settlements. The non-English settlements together with the French explorations in the interior are grouped in a second chapter, while the third covers the Restoration period, including later settlements, Indian wars, and the struggles over the charters.

The conventional order of taking up the settlement and early history of each colony in succession has been in this way successfully avoided. The French activities of the seventeenth century are handled in such a way as to blend with the general narrative and pave the way to a proper understanding of the struggle between France and England.

A common offence of text-book writers is a proneness to treat the history of America as utterly distinct from and unaffected by European affairs. With this connection with Europe not revealed, our colonial and even later history is but half told. Professor Hart has in this respect sinned less than most others. Yet nowhere does he explain why England was so late in entering the field of colonization; nowhere is there an adequate statement of the motives (economic and other) for English colony-planting. Added meaning might have been given to the granting of the charters of Rhode Island and Connecticut, of New Jersey and Carolina, and of the possessions of the Duke of York, had their almost simultaneous granting been emphasized together with their intimate connection with other favors and rewards conferred by the king at the Restoration.

A group of chapters under the general title "Colonial Americans" covers the period 1689 to 1763. In the past, with eyes fixed upon political events, writers have disposed of this three-quarters of a century of colonial existence in a few generalizations and have used the colonial wars as a convenient bridge to take them safely over the troublesome void and bring them to the sure footing of the Revolution. Here two chapters are introduced upon "Colonial Life" and "Internal Development" giving a very satisfactory view of eighteenth-century life, though the principle of division between the chapters is not clear. In them are noted home life, education, religion, literature, commerce

and its restrictions, smuggling and privateering, paper money, boundary-controversies, and local institutions. Then follows the account of the colonial wars.

The author continues the use of the provincial terms "King William's War", "Queen Anne's War", and "King George's War", failing to show that they are but faint reflections of tremendous wars waged in Europe under other names. Even in discussing the last French war slight suggestion is offered of the world-wide significance of the struggle for colonial empire then going on.

In dealing with the subject of colonial government the time-honored but inaccurate classification by Blackstone is adhered to. The statement is made (p. 78) that "in 1663 the English had in America three chartered colonies, one proprietary colony and two royal colonies", although the proprietary colony of Maryland was as truly a chartered colony as the three in New England. From the text elsewhere (p. 110) the student might suppose that after 1624 but three of all the colonies were held under charters.

The accounts of the Revolution and the "Critical Period" present no marked features, unless it be the temperate treatment of the period of intellectual resistance to England, including a recognition of the number and standing of the Loyalists, the reduction to their real dimensions of such affairs as the Boston Massacre, and an absence of "Fourth of July" rhetoric. It might have been well further to state why it was found necessary to send German hirelings to America.

The chapters covering the period from 1789 to the close of the Civil War call for little comment. In addition to political events, as the author suggests (p. 7), "social conditions and events have been freely described" and "much attention has been given to economic data". Besides such economic phenomena as are noted in the general narrative, special chapters are introduced dealing with reforms, education, religion, social life and customs during the period. It is true that most of the important facts in our economic development are noted, yet had they been brought together in a more suitable grouping their relation to each other and their influence upon political affairs would have been more apparent. This is especially evident in the chapters on "The Settling of the West" and "The New National Spirit".

From the otherwise satisfactory account of Reconstruction more accurate conclusions might have been reached had greater emphasis been laid on the fact that this wretched episode did more to dig a chasm between the North and the South than the war itself.

There are numerous maps and illustrations throughout the book, but the attempt is sometimes made to show too many things upon the same map. At the end of each chapter are ample lists of references to secondary authorities, sources, and illustrative materials. A bibliography and a few documents are appended.

Upon the whole this work of Professor Hart deserves commendation.

tion and should meet with a cordial welcome among a wide circle of teachers.

FRANK GREENE BATES.

Breaking the Wilderness. By FREDERICK S. DELLENBAUGH. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905. Pp. xxiii, 360.)

THE above is the suggestive title of an attempt to cover the field of western exploration "from the Wanderings of Cabeza de Vaca, to the First Descent of the Colorado by Powell, and the completion of the Union Pacific Railway." A hasty comparison of the present volume with others covering the same ground, would seem to show that the author has achieved a measurable degree of success. He begins with a clear, concise, yet highly picturesque definition of his "Wilderness"—the national domain from the Mississippi to the Pacific. To each of the animals—the bison and the beaver—that played an important but a melancholy part in its "breaking", he devotes a chapter, and likewise two chapters to its native inhabitants—always the "Amerinds". These preliminary chapters, forming a third of the book, are followed by eleven devoted to the explorers who figure in this wilderness-breaking. These men are apparently divided into two classes,—those who, in a sense, circumnavigate this continental wilderness, and those who penetrate its inmost fastnesses. In the former class then appear not merely the great names that we naturally expect—De Soto, Coronado, La Salle, La Verendrye, McKenzie, Gray—but also a host of others who rendered scarcely less efficient service. In the latter, the names of Lewis, Clark, Pike, James, Frémont, and Powell, as well as scores of others of lesser light, suggest an almost exclusive predominance. Throughout the whole volume there has been an earnest attempt to render due credit to the different nationalities and to the various human elements that assisted in the fascinating task of bringing civilization to the wilds. The writer is especially to be commended for his efforts to make complete the list of names connected with western exploration, especially of the Spanish explorers in the far Southwest.

Another commendable characteristic of the work is its general spirit of fairness, particularly in discussing Indian problems and the Mormons; although this leads to an indefinite position on the Whitman controversy (pp. 289, 290). Among minor points of treatment the author produces a new and plausible theory in connection with New Mexican exploration (p. 114); conjectures that the Upper Missouri (pp. 160, 164, 166) was more familiar to white men than Lewis and Clark believed; and ordinarily bases his conclusions, often original, upon reasons which appear well founded.

One questions whether he does not assign too much space to Lewis and Clark, but at this time such a course is almost unavoidable. He does, however, fail to do justice to Pike (p. 192). He gives a clear statement about the founding of Santa Fé (p. 116), the indefiniteness of early Louisiana limits (map, p. 154), and the haphazard way in

which the United States acquired its title to Oregon (p. 150). His own wilderness experience enables him to point out the absurd equipment of Pike (pp. 181, 186) and of Long (p. 226) for their tasks.

Amid much that is excellent one regrets the presence of many inaccuracies: San Antonio was not founded in 1692 (p. 134), Crozat did not receive his grant two years after New Orleans was founded (p. 138), the Treaty of 1783 did not limit the United States "to the mouth of the Yazoo" (p. 144), West Florida was not seized in 1812 (map, p. 154), the forces of Malgares in 1806 did not go "as far as the Sabine" (p. 181), and Natchitoches (not "Nachitoches") was not a "Spanish post in Texas".

Other expressions may be classed as erroneous because they state as definite, matters that are far from certain. Among these are the identification of the *Espiritu Santo* of Piñeda as the Mississippi, and the placing of its discovery before 1510 (p. 104); the identification of the River of the Palms as the Rio Grande, and of the mysterious western river mentioned by the Indians to the French as the Columbia (p. 133); and the vague statement that Iberville's settlement in 1699 was "near the mouth of the Mississippi" (p. 134). The varying assertions (pp. 155, 157, 160) of the relation between the expedition of Lewis and Clark and the Louisiana Purchase are misleading. The extract from Jefferson's instructions (p. 161) relates to the Indians, although Freeman, in 1806, made use of similar powers when threatened by the Spaniards. The name of the English trader "Haney" (p. 163) is given by Thwaites as "Henney". The text (p. 178) would seem to imply that Pike was selected by Jefferson for his exploration; but Wilkinson was responsible for this choice.

Barring the deficiencies which mar its critical value, Mr. Dellenbaugh has produced a fairly satisfactory work and one that from its excellent typography and abundant illustration should prove deservedly successful in arousing general interest in his subject. An index and numerous references to the more popular sources add to its value.

ISAAC JOSLIN COX.

Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1780. Edited from the Original Records in the Library of Congress by WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD, Chief of the Division of Manuscripts. Vol. I., 1774; Vol. II., 1775, May 10—September 20; Vol. III. 1775, September 21—December 30. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1904, 1905, 1905. Pp. 143, 1-256, 257-538.)

A DOCUMENTARY series of such fundamental importance to our history as the journals of the Continental Congress ought long since to have been set before the historical and general public in its integrity and in a worthy form. It has long been known that the contemporary printed editions and, without the same excuse on grounds of public safety, the reprints of 1800 and 1823, were very far from complete; and certainly the last-named, the edition commonly used, was not in respect

to appearance a thing to be proud of. Now that the original manuscripts have been transferred to the Library of Congress, Mr. Ford comes forward with the beginnings of an edition which may fairly be called definitive. If it is not in all respects a model of what such a publication should be (and in nearly all respects it is), it certainly is in all ways worthy of a great governmental establishment and of a body of material hardly equalled in its significance for the history of the United States.

Mr. Ford prints on light paper and in large type. The number of pages in a volume is, it will be seen, not large. Unless the years 1774 and 1775 are not typical with respect to additions to the old text, the completion of the record will require nearly forty such volumes. Additions to the old text are very numerous, and sometimes of much importance. In one place, a week's transactions in Congress have left hardly any trace on the journals as formerly printed. In another (II, 218), an interesting series of resolutions regarding saltpetre, though absent even from the manuscript of the journals, has been recovered from a pamphlet printed by authority of Congress. The editor by no means contents himself with the mere text of the original manuscript journals, but when reports or documents prepared by committees are mentioned there, he inserts them from the papers of the Old Congress, the contemporary newspapers or other sources. Much of the most valuable editorial comment consists of learned notes on these documents. In some cases, where various drafts of them are extant, these are presented *seriatim*. A particularly interesting example is that of the Declaration on taking up Arms (II, 128-157). At the end of Vol. III, John Adams's notes of debates from September 23 to October 30, 1775, are presented. Valuable and illuminating as these are, it seems an anomaly to include them without making use of other extant diaries. Vol. I. contains several photographic facsimiles of important documents. At the end of Vols. I. and III. a bibliography of the printed pieces issued by Congress is presented; also an excellent index.

Much as one must admire this monumental work, it has several blemishes. In the first place, such a publication should, according to all the best modern practice, begin with a full and critical account of the manuscript sources whence it is derived. Mr. Ford's very meagre preface to Vol. I. contains nothing of the sort, and if some fragments of information on the subject are presented in the preface to Vol. II., they are inadequate, and not always clearly expressed. We are informed (III, 515) that general remarks on the printed editions are postponed to the end of the series. Perhaps the same is true of the manuscripts. Meanwhile readers may like to know—a fact not mentioned in these volumes—that an elaborate account of the manuscripts was presented by Dr. Herbert Friedenwald in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History*, Vol. XXI. Another important desideratum is a complete list of members of Congress in at least the two years 1774 and 1775. Such a list, general or special, should have been prefixed either to the whole work or to each volume. Thirdly, while there is much use of erased type, it

is not clear, at any rate to the present reviewer, just what it indicates. Finally, there is a decided infelicity in the half-separate, half-united condition of Vols. II. and III. They have one preface, one pagination, one bibliographical appendix, one index; and the phrase "this volume" in the preface and elsewhere in Vol. II. (II. 253) is used in a sense that includes both. Yet they have separate title-pages and are bound as two volumes. If there has been hesitation between two plans of arrangement, it is to be hoped that hereafter the unit will be the volume and not the calendar year; to make the latter the unit for indexing, it is certain, would cause much trouble to the multitude of students who will hereafter use this splendid work.

The Civil Service and the Patronage. By CARL RUSSELL FISH, Assistant Professor of American History in the University of Wisconsin. [Harvard Historical Studies, Vol. XI.] (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1905. Pp. xi, 280.)

THE recent work of Mr. Fish is the most important and valuable contribution that has been made to the history of the civil service in this country. The function of the historian is not simply to enumerate facts in a chronological order, but through these facts to interpret the spirit of an age. Any trained student with an accurate mind and sufficient time can count the number of removals from office made by all the presidents from Washington to Roosevelt, but it is the work of the historian, as differentiated from that of the investigator, to show through these removals the development of a complex system and to associate these removals with other events apparently unconnected with them. It is in this that the chief merit of Mr. Fish's work consists. The book, moreover, is interesting, and it is therefore a welcome illustration of the principle urged by a growing number of historians that a history may be thoroughly scientific and yet not be so dull that "it can be read only by the author and the proof-reader."

The book falls naturally into four parts: the first deals with the history of appointments and removals down to the administration of President Jackson, the second treats of the genesis of the spoils system, the third part considers the struggle between the spoils system and its foes, while the fourth is a frank exposition of the difficulties inherent in any mechanical system of selecting officers.

The first part contains little in effect that is new. Additional facts have been gleaned in regard to well-known cases of removal; the number of removals in every administration prior to that of President Jackson is shown to be greater than has generally been thought, while it is also made clear that more of these removals were apparently made for political reasons than had been supposed to be the case. Yet while the investigation of all of these points has given a broader basis for conclusions, it is a question whether it has really altered the conclusions previously drawn in regard to the early period. The one disputed question of the period has been whether President Jefferson introduced

the spoils system or not,—his opponents have maintained that he did, his supporters that he did not. Mr. Fish squares the circle by deciding that he technically introduced the spoils system, but that the introduction did no harm at that time (p. 51).

The most valuable part of the book is the second section, dealing with the genesis of the spoils system. This is a genuine contribution to the history of the subject. Mr. Fish shows very clearly that the principle of rotation in elective offices had been in force in the legislative and in the executive departments of all the Northern and the Western states almost from the first colonial settlements and that the custom had everywhere been justified as one necessary in educating the public in the business of government, as well as in protecting the people from possible usurpations of power on the part of office-holders. Thus the theory and the practice of rotation in elective office were generally familiar and it was but a natural step to transfer both, first from the state to the national government and then from elective to appointive offices. President Jackson therefore found a soil well prepared for the introduction of the spoils system into national politics,—had it been otherwise, the evil would not so quickly have grown to gigantic size.

In discussing the struggle between the spoils system and its foes, Mr. Fish finds that prior to the plan for genuine reform inaugurated by Mr. Jenckes, the struggle had in reality been less against the spoils system itself than a struggle between the President and the Senate for the control of the spoils. The President was restive under the senatorial control exercised in the confirmation of nominations, while the Senate was jealous of the exclusive right of initiating appointments given the President by the Constitution. Thus the matter practically stood when the battle-field was transferred to the House through the introduction of the Jenckes Bill in 1865. That the measure finally became a law in 1883 was perhaps due less to genuine interest in reform *per se* than to a growing appreciation of the necessity of conducting government business by business methods.

The fourth part, dealing with the period of civil service reform, is much less full than are the other divisions of the work. Its chief value lies in its candid statements of the difficulties inherent in any system of appointment through competitive examination. Many adherents of the present system will, however, differ with Mr. Fish in regard to some of his conclusions,—that the permanent civil service will not be able to draw in many men fitted for the highest posts (p. 234), and other similar statements. The business of the government has shared in the general business tendency of the age towards organization on a large scale and the leadership of the many by the few. The day of the small business is for the time being eclipsed and able young men accept that fact both in private business and in government service.

The special contribution that the work makes to the literature of the subject is that the author goes behind the face of the returns and shows that the spoils system flourished in congenial soil, while the

reform has been in large part due to the perfection of business methods in the country at large and the consequent demand for the application of the same principles to the conduct of affairs of government.

The place that civil service reform has come to occupy in our political system is indicated by the wealth of material bearing on the subject. The selected, classified and annotated bibliography fills thirteen pages in Mr. Fish's work,—a list that would have given courage to the early reformers could they have foreseen it. An unfortunate omission is that of *Harper's Weekly*,—under the able editorship of George William Curtis it must share equally with the *Nation* (p. 261) the credit of effective promotion of civil service reform.

It is to be regretted that the name of so valiant a champion of the reform movement as Mr. George McAneny should be almost unrecognizable on p. 227 and in the index, that the American Historical Association should appear as the American Historical Society (pp. 253, 265), and that a careless proof-reading (p. 254) should change the nationality of the distinguished Von Holst. The letter of Mrs. Graham to Washington (footnote, p. 80) is an interesting one, but the extract given is quite obscure without accompanying explanation,—“that sketch of a democratical government” refers to a tract addressed by Mrs. Graham to Paoli.
L. M. S.

Our Navy and the Barbary Corsairs. By GARDNER W. ALLEN.
(Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1905. Pp. xiii, 354.)

MR. ALLEN'S book treats of the relations of the United States with the Barbary Powers from 1794, when the United States made its first effective preparations for war, until 1816, when its last war with a Barbary state ended. Introductory to this main part of the book, are brief but excellent historical accounts of the White Slavery in the Barbary States, the Early American Captives in Barbary, and the First Negotiations of the United States with the Barbary States, covering the period from 1776 to 1793. This introduction comprises forty-eight pages. The relations between the United States and the Barbary Powers from 1794 to 1800 comprise forty-three pages; from 1801 to 1805, one hundred and eighty-one pages; and from 1806 to 1816, twenty-nine pages. Two pages of comment close the volume. It is thus seen that three-fifths of the book treats of the period from 1801 to 1805. This large space, however, is not out of proportion, since our relations with the Barbary States during Jefferson's first administration were more extensive and complicated than during any other period of our history. The chief event of the period from 1801 to 1805 treated by Mr. Allen is of course the war with Tripoli. The capture of the *Philadelphia* by the Tripolitans, its destruction by the Americans, and Eaton's capture of Derne, each a most dramatic and picturesque incident, form the subjects of separate chapters. The author's account of Commodore Preble's attack on Tripoli covers rather familiar ground. In the period of 1794-1800 Mr. Allen

has found material for an interesting chapter on the "impressment" of the American naval ship, *George Washington*, and its voyage to Constantinople on an errand of the Dey of Algiers. Other subjects of this period that are treated are the treaties of peace with Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis. The chief event of the last period is the war with Algiers during 1815 and 1816.

Mr. Allen's facts are in general, although by no means entirely, either of a naval or of a diplomatic character. The naval information naturally exceeds the diplomatic. He has chiefly drawn his naval information from the manuscripts of the Navy Department and the Library of Congress, books on the lives of naval officers, naval histories, and Goldsborough's *Naval Chronicle*. He has based his diplomatic history largely upon the *American State Papers*, *Wait's State Papers and Publick Documents*, *Eaton's* and *Felton's Life of Eaton*, *Cathcart's letters*, the *Writings of Jefferson*, and *Shaler's Sketches of Algiers*. These by no means exhaust the list of Mr. Allen's authorities, which he publishes in the appendix in the form of an excellent bibliographical note with explanatory remarks. By means of appropriate foot-notes the author throughout the volume indicates the sources of his information. By abbreviating the names of his authorities he has brought his foot-notes within a small compass, and thereby has indulged the sensibilities of the popular reader.

The author has based his narrative solidly and closely upon his sources of information, which he uses with discrimination and judgment. His numerous quotations and his adequate foot-notes and bibliography give complete confidence in his accuracy and painstaking care. His conclusions and comments are conservative and well-balanced. One sometimes wishes that there were more of them, and that the author had injected a larger subjective element into his objective narrative. A reader often demands of an historian his conclusions as well as the evidence upon which they are to be based.

Our Navy and the Barbary Corsairs is a good example of a book that is scientific and at the same time popular. It is popular by reason of the dramatic quality of the information that it contains. Its interest lies in the intrinsic interest of its facts. The narrative is plain, simple, and straightforward. The author has employed none of the allurements of style in order to catch and hold the attention of the dull or indifferent reader. His language is clear and acceptable.

In addition to a bibliography the appendix contains a synopsis of the early treaties between the United States and the Barbary Powers, a list of vessels and officers serving in the Mediterranean during the war with Tripoli, the casualties in Commodore Preble's squadron, a letter of the Dey of Algiers to President Madison dated April 24, 1816, and a letter of President Madison to the Dey dated August 21, 1816.

CHARLES OSCAR PAULIN.

The Life of Thomas Hart Benton. By WILLIAM M. MEIGS. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1904. Pp. 533.)

Thomas H. Benton. By JOSEPH M. ROGERS. (Philadelphia: Geo. W. Jacobs and Company. 1905. Pp. 361.)

THE almost simultaneous publication of two important biographies of Thomas H. Benton—only a month between them—is another of the many signs of the rising interest in the formative history of the Middle West. These two volumes not only signify a growing interest in that part of American history, but also show that the general historical reader, as well as the student, is more and more harking back to the origin of things, when ideas and institutions were in the process of becoming what they are now. Without doubt two such studies will stimulate this interest, and will help to give to American readers an abiding interest in the first great trans-Mississippi statesman.

Benton is a character that furnishes an occasion for good writing. Both authors seem to have appreciated this, for there is not a dull page in either book. But Benton's activities were so tremendous and the fruits of his labor so great that he presents a strong temptation to eulogy and hero-worship. Neither author has sinned in this regard, although there runs through each volume an undertone of deep appreciation of Benton's ability and character.

It may truly be said that both authors have dealt with the great deeds accomplished by this masterful man in a most interesting way. The main lines of Benton's career are set out clearly and forcibly; his entry into the Senate; his long fight for the repeal of the salt tax; his championing for years of the policy of giving settlers cheap western lands—the origin of the later Homestead Laws; his part in the rivalry between the East and the South and West; the long bitter fight against the United States Bank and paper money, his incessant effort to secure the attention of the country and the government to the Oregon country, and his splendid faith in its future significance in relation to Asiatic commerce; the gradual break between Benton and the South on slavery and disunion, resulting in his defeat for a sixth term in the Senate; his short career in the House of Representatives; and his unshaken devotion to the Union on the verge of Civil War, are presented quite fully. These great subjects occupy the greater portions of both works. Throughout both volumes interest is heightened by attention to the many interesting and often dramatic episodes in which Benton was involved. Among them are the quarrel and fight with Jackson, duels with Charles Lucas, reconciliation with, and warm friendship for, Jackson; the debates over the expunging resolution; clashes on the floor of the Senate with Clay, Calhoun, and Foote the fire-eater of Mississippi; his last campaign, at over seventy-four years of age, in which Benton travelled over twelve hundred miles and made over forty speeches; and that final scene, the struggle with death to enable him to finish his *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress*. In these scenes the aggressive and fighting elements of Benton's character are well

brought out, and add a spice of human interest which seldom appears in serious biographical writings. Both authors emphasize the tremendous difficulties of prejudice, rival ambitions, and conflicting sectional interests which often stood in Benton's way, and the essentially broad and statesmanlike views and motives which stimulated him to fight till he won. The reader is made to feel that here is an open and manly opponent who called a spade a spade; who faced enemies on the so-called "field of honor", as well as on the stump or in the Senate; who served nearly a generation in the Senate without accumulating wealth; who genuinely served his state and nation and who, in his long career, never directly or indirectly championed the interest of a few against the interests of the many. Both biographies emphasize the wholesome relation which Benton sustained to his constituents, and show that he practised, consciously or unconsciously, the high ideals set forth in Burke's *Address to the Electors of Bristol*. With all its faults Benton's character is made to appear worthy of the study of every American who aspires to participate in local or national politics.

These two lives, however, will not appeal in equal degree to the student of history and to the reader of history. Meigs's was written for the student by a student. Rogers's was written for the general reader by one who writes daily for the general reader, and is a volume of the "American Crisis Biographies". A number of points of contrast will justify this conclusion, at least in part. Meigs contains more frequent and fuller quotations from Benton's speeches and writings and gives exact references to pages and volumes. Rogers not only contains fewer quotations, but has not a single exact reference to a single authority. It is true that in his "Bibliography", Rogers cites general histories and "Reminiscences", but fails to mention any special treatises such as Catterall's *Second Bank*, although he declares that he has used many sources not named. Meigs appeals to the student by a more judicial and critical attitude. He finds several disputed questions difficult to untangle, while Rogers's pen moves right on, as if there were no obstacles in the way and no doubts to raise as to fact and interpretation. The method of approach is strikingly different. Meigs spends more than one hundred and fifty pages in working out what might be regarded as the social and political environment out of which Benton arose, including a very interesting sketch of the men in the Senate in 1821 who exerted a strong influence over him. Benton cannot be understood as the student wishes to understand him, without such a study of early surroundings. Rogers's chapter on Benton's entry into the Senate closes on page 54.

There is hardly an over-statement or a serious error to be found in Meigs. But now and then Rogers will indulge in such statements as the following: "Henry Clay came to the front with his first compromise. It was effected solely through his agency" (p. 32). On the opposite page he declares that "this compromise" (the Missouri Compromise) "was to a great extent the work of Benton". Putting aside

the contradiction in these two sentences, there is considerable history behind each which ought to have produced different statements. Benton of course was not recognized as a Senator and had no right to vote or speak till Missouri was proclaimed a state of the Union. Rogers pronounces Clay "a man of unbridled ambition", "the father of the protective tariff system" and declares that in the Compromise of 1850 "Clay and Calhoun had their way and left a heritage of Civil War to posterity". In this connection he also asserts that President Taylor wished to "try conclusions with the South." Sentences such as these, scattered here and there, force the conclusion that Rogers did not entirely shake off his editorial habit of popular statement when producing a serious historical work. The writing of a biography of Benton for general readers is a serious task, and Rogers has accomplished it.

W. H. MACE.

The Crisis of the Confederacy: A History of Gettysburg and the Wilderness. By CECIL BATTINE, Captain 15th The King's Hussars. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Company. 1905. Pp. xv, 424; six maps.)

It is not surprising that the campaigns and battles of the four years' war between the American States, and the careers of the great leaders on the two sides should attract the attention and be the study of military students and critics in other lands. But it is surprising that foreign students and war-critics should give such thorough and careful study to these leaders and their campaigns as to produce books that are most complete in their comprehension of all the elements of history, and most accurate in detail. Col. Henderson's *Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War* as a narrative of Jackson's campaigns, and a study of the strategy of that military genius, is the most complete and detailed ever written. No American writer has produced so full and thorough a discussion and history of Jackson and his campaigns as this accomplished English officer.

The same may be said of Captain Battine's book. No book to this time has given so comprehensive and so accurate a narrative of the Gettysburg campaign, from the standpoint of the impartial historian. Of Henderson it may be said that he had become convinced of the justice of the cause of the Southern Confederacy, and was an enthusiastic admirer of Stonewall Jackson and of the Southern soldiery which followed Jackson. But Captain Battine announces no judgment of the righteousness of the contest on either side. There is a well-guarded reserve as to his convictions and his sympathies. With an impartiality that is we believe unbroken, he studies with great fairness the whole campaign, from the standpoint of a military student and critic. With the politics of the great conflict he has nothing to do, and of neither side is he a partisan. It is one of the great values of this book that it is the work of an author who is neither Northern nor Southern, who has not committed himself to a judgment on the great question at issue, and who is

here engaged in a just and careful study of the critical period of the war, in the interest of military science.

The book is an octavo volume of over four hundred pages, somewhat compactly printed, and is therefore quite a full and substantial volume. Its maps are well prepared, and are, on the whole, accurate reproductions of the country as it was in the time of war. It is not at all a complete history of the downfall of the military power of the Southern States, but it aims to be "a concise account of the most critical phase of this great Civil War." There is no attempt to embrace the elements of weakness that existed in finance, in blockaded ports, in lack of manufactures, in imperfect transportation, nor is there any outline of the campaigns in the West, and the seizure of the Mississippi River.

But with Gettysburg in view, the author gives a brief account of the campaigns in Virginia from the beginning. And this is done to bring the reader to the breaking of the war at Gettysburg, with an intelligent comprehension of the conditions which there existed, the generals who commanded, and the battalions which were now filled with veteran soldiers, who had passed through long marches and well fought battles. Chancellorsville is especially studied as the field from which the invasion of Pennsylvania has seemed to many the logical and necessary conclusion. Then the cavalry engagement at Brandy Station is fully narrated, and the capture of Winchester by General Ewell, and the defeat of Milroy. With most admirable care, Captain Battine has studied many sources of information, and knows well the books both North and South. He is familiar with the topography of Northern Virginia, follows the movement of Stuart in Fauquier and Prince William with intelligence, and gives as complete an account of his daring but mistaken ride to the east of Hooker into Pennsylvania as exists in print to-day.

The great and critical contest at Gettysburg is treated not as a three days' battle, but correctly as three battles on three successive days. There was to both sides the unexpected conflict on Willoughby's Run, three miles west of the town, with its Confederate success. There was the second battle, when in the afternoon of the second day Longstreet at last struck the extreme left flank of the Federal army, and defeated Sickles at the Peach Orchard. And there was the third battle, when on the afternoon of the third day Pickett's column struck the left centre of the enemy's line on the ridge, and unsupported fell back a broken, exhausted wave from the overwhelming numbers holding a strong position. No important part of the struggle is omitted. The condition of the armies on both sides is carefully narrated, the arrivals on the field, the delays, the confusions, the mistakes are told candidly. Many books have been written from many viewpoints, and no doubt sincere attempts to do justice to all have been made. But nowhere we believe is there so just and impartial a narrative of the struggles around the little Pennsylvania town, on which hung so critically the issues of the whole war, and the turning-point of American history.

The author has not failed to see that from the Southern side, the

reasons for failure at Gettysburg are to be found in a number of facts. There was the absence of Stuart and his cavalry, which he attributes to indefinite instructions from the commanding general; the lack of a prompt initiative on the part of General Ewell on the evening of the first day; the unsoldierly recalcitrance of General Longstreet, and his lack of sympathy with the wishes of General Lee; and yet more pervading and controlling, the loss of Stonewall Jackson. "With the fatal shot which struck down Stonewall Jackson began the series of disastrous events leading to the conquest of the Confederacy."

The author of this book is an educated professional soldier, acquainted with the principles of military science as taught in the English schools, and as exemplified in all modern warfare. From this standpoint his criticisms are made, and will be regarded, we are confident, with much respect. In his view the Richmond government erred in not concentrating all possible force in Lee's army of Northern Virginia, drawing everything possible from the South and West for the strongest aggressive movement. At the sacrifice of some minor interests, the whole strength should have been thrown into a decisive campaign. Again and again, Captain Battine urges that it was a great mistake in tactics that the cavalry was not kept in operation with the infantry on the field, and pushed in massed columns upon every weakened point. He thinks that on both sides in the American war there was need of a much better staff organization of professionally educated officers, with definite assignments to duty. After crossing the Potomac, the author thinks, instead of going so far afield into Pennsylvania, General Lee should have promptly turned east toward Frederick, and fought the battle near to his communications, and nearer to the enemy's base at Washington. Of Gettysburg, he speaks as distinctly "the soldiers' battle," the Southern soldiers fighting with a courage and sacrifice unparalleled. Their leaders of highest rank did not rise to the occasion, and failed in harmony and concert of action.

We have found it a matter of constant regret that the able and accomplished author of this valuable book has not given in foot-notes references to the authorities on which his narrative is based. He has made an extensive research through the literature of the war. It would have added greatly to the permanent historical value of the book, if he had given the references to reports and personal narratives, with which he evidently has most intelligent acquaintance. We have no reason to question his statistical tables, and we believe that they conform in the main with the reports and statements of Generals Hooker, Meade, and Humphreys, and of the Confederate authorities. But it would have been eminently satisfactory if these sources of information had been cited.

A few errors we have noted, that may not be of especial importance, but their correction in another edition may protect the reader from some confusion of thought: Page 15, the eleventh line from the bottom, should read, "were marching Southeast," not "Southwest"; page 50, "were cantoned South and East," not "West"; page 71, "Field Hos-

pital at the *Wilderness*," not at "Dowdall's Tavern"; page 155, first line, "Lee's messenger found Ewell with Early," Early and his division were at York, quite well to the East; page 122, first line, "Robertson's *Confederate Brigade*," not "Federal."

Captain Battine has done faithful and able work in his book, and it must remain a permanent contribution to the history of the crisis of the Confederacy, the breaking of the wave of the Southern soldiers' victory, when it had reached the very crest of the ridge against which it rose.

J. P. S.

History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850. By JAMES FORD RHODES, LL.D., Litt.D. Vol. V., 1864-1866. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904. Pp. xii, 650.)

MR. RHODES's fifth volume begins with Sherman's march to the sea and ends with the Congressional elections of the autumn of 1866. The first three chapters bring to a close his long, careful, and thorough narrative of the Civil War. The next two chapters discuss, with equal fullness, the life of both the sections in war-time, throwing light on many subjects never before so well treated in any general work, and setting in a just perspective facts and deeds and men that have too often been neglected. One is glad to find the work of the Sanitary Commission amply described and to see such unobtrusive patriots as Frederick Law Olmsted and James B. Fry taking their places with the captains and the statesmen.

A shorter chapter deals with the most repellent topics that confront the student of the period—military prisons, North and South, and such episodes as the Dahlgren raid and the Fort Pillow massacre. In the opening paragraphs of this particular chapter, Mr. Rhodes, discussing the material for the study of the prison controversy, tells us, with his usual candor, that he cannot claim to have mastered it all; but in those very paragraphs, as well as in the résumé that follows, he exhibits admirably well some of his best qualities as a historian. No subject, surely, could test more severely his patience, fairness, and good sense; and so well does he stand the test that I shall be surprised if any future investigation shall seriously shake his general conclusions. Neither side escapes blame, no part of the revolting story is obscured, and yet intelligent men of both sides will, I fancy, find in Mr. Rhodes's judgments a certain relief. It is war, rather than men, that he in substance chiefly arraigns. When one has finished his unsparing recital of the facts, his portrayal of the hideous sufferings of helpless brave men, it is Sherman's famous saying about war that comes into one's mind. With the maxim, "All the right is never on one side and all the wrong on the other," Mr. Rhodes makes his real summary of the whole wretched business. He thus also incidentally displays the temper in which this volume has been written.

As an excuse for what he would have us consider a rather hurried handling of the voluminous material of the prison controversy, Mr.

Rhodes offers his great desire to see his long task finished. That desire, no doubt, also explains why his final chapter covers a longer period than all the others in the volume. Putting aside everything but Reconstruction, this chapter recounts—briefly, for Mr. Rhodes, but carefully, clearly, and with a full display of sources—all the important steps by which President Johnson and the Republicans in Congress came to an open breach before the country. Salient features of the author's treatment of this difficult period are his marked preference for Lincoln over all the other men that ever in any wise took a hand in Reconstruction, and his equally clear approval, at a later stage, of the plan for which Trumbull and Fessenden were chiefly responsible. Both judgments will strongly commend themselves to open-minded students who do not fail to note how the conditions of the problem were constantly changing. One infers that in the next volume the narrative will proceed even faster. Mr. Rhodes is eminently well-equipped for a close study of the early years of peace; but no one who rightly appreciates his labors for the truth of history can begrudge him an earlier completion of his entire undertaking than he could possibly compass without some change of plan.

Whatever the future may show, he has to his credit one fairly well defined achievement. He has finished in this volume the best history of the Civil War. The reviewer would rather dwell a moment on that fact—not, he would hope, without some interest for Americans far outside of the ranks of the history-writing brotherhood—than scrutinize, after the minute and technical fashion in criticism most affected in these pages, the one volume now before us. After all, the merely technical side of the historian's work is quite the least important. In no other department of scholarship is it so nearly possible to dispense altogether with anything like a professional training and equipment: a consideration, however, which becomes less encouraging when one has to add that of all scholars the historian needs the amplest general training, both from study and experience, and the most various equipment. Nor does any other scholar need to keep alive so many interests, sympathies, enthusiasms. We should all, I fancy, be the better fitted for our own work in history if our interest in such work as this of Mr. Rhodes were less professional than human; if in each successive volume we looked first for the past—for heroes and battles, for statesmen and measures, for the life of other times—and only later considered the object-lesson in methods, the merely shoppish values in the work.

I venture thus to moralize apropos of this book rather than another because I think Mr. Rhodes's work so clearly entitled to the first place among the various enterprises in historiography now in progress in this country. Even more might be said of its importance. A very distinguished critic of American civilization, who is also singularly observant of the intellectual life of other lands, in the course of a comparison of our recent work in letters with that of Englishmen which was generally unfavorable to American writers, made an exception of history. In

that field, he thought, we had quite held our own. And now that Green and Stubbs and Freeman and Creighton are gone, is there in England any historian who to a subject equally large has devoted, as Mr. Rhodes has, ample time, means, patience, and ability? It is not unreasonable, I think, to claim for the work of this American historian an importance not quite equalled by the work of any of his contemporaries who are writing history in the same tongue.

The claim, of course, cannot rest solely or mainly on the mere bulk of his endeavor, the scale of his devotion. The work must be excellent after its kind. But on this point also the judgment of competent critics is, I suppose, made up. They seem to be fairly unanimous, and the essence of their consensus is, that Mr. Rhodes tells the truth. It would probably be hard to improve on that plain statement of the solid excellence of all his work. And it conveys, in his case, very high praise. Mr. Rhodes has been dealing with very live matter; with events that have all happened in his own life-time; with questions still warmly debated; with a great war, the wounds of which are not all healed; with men who are themselves still among the living or for whom women still wear mourning. If we can nearly all agree that his long recital is, in the least sophisticated sense, truthful, I am not sure that we do not thereby pay him the very highest tribute of all.

And to pronounce him truthful we need not be ourselves experts in his period, or even trained students of history. He has supplied us with ample means to verify his facts, to weigh his conclusions. His references and citations, always abundant, seem to grow more voluminous with each successive volume. In the volume before us they are so detailed and careful that sometimes, when the point at issue is of no great consequence, the effect is fairly comical. On page 5, for instance, speaking of a notion at one time prevalent in the North that General Sherman was out of his head, Mr. Rhodes cites in a footnote a newspaper editorial expressing the opinion. Macaulay, one fancies, or even Gibbon, would have thought this sufficient. But Mr. Rhodes adds, "I have had a careful search made of the files of the *New York Tribune* and *Cincinnati Commercial*, and feel pretty sure that this is the first charge of insanity published in the newspapers". To determine whether tinned vegetables were ever issued to the Union troops, he sought the help of a scientist who studied for him the history of the canning industry. Fortified with this and other testimony, he writes (p. 249 n.): "It may be affirmed with confidence that canned peas and canned string-beans were not furnished the army or the Sanitary Commission at any time during the war". The reader feels that with such a guide he is safe from the negative deception of omissions, as well as from anything approaching a wilful perversion of the truth. It is impossible to suspect Mr. Rhodes of withholding, either for partisan or artistic reasons, anything that tends to enlightenment. I cannot think of another historian who so constantly produces the effect of complete candor, who is so indefatigably minded to tell all that can be

reckoned of consequence, and to display unreservedly the sources of his knowledge and the grounds of his opinions. Citations in the text are so common that some readers will doubtless think them a fault of style. Many pages are little better than mosaics, being made up wholly of quotations, thinly cemented with the author's merely explanatory comments.

This may be one of the reasons why Mr. Rhodes is sometimes criticized as cautious and non-committal. No doubt we should all be glad, now and then, if he would make a little more of his own opinions, and speak "as one having authority". In this particular volume, for instance, although he gives us material in plenty for a judgment of Sherman's course with private property and with non-combatants, he himself pronounces none at all. A historian is of necessity a teacher of morals, and one expects a comment on Sherman's declaration that if he had thought it advisable, for military reasons, to burn Columbia, he would have burnt it with no more feeling than if it had been a prairie-dog village. But on the whole the charge of non-committalism is unjust. Mr. Rhodes is usually bold enough and clear enough in stating his conclusions, both about facts and men. If he seems lacking in that sort of candor, it is because, besides his candor in displaying his sources, he is also extremely candid in forming his opinions. He has the poise, the charity and fairness, and the knowledge of life, that usually make for moderation, hardly ever for startling pronouncements. On this very subject of sweeping judgments he has stated his own view clearly. It will probably be disappointing to his younger, but not to his older readers. Quoting Macaulay's brilliant sentence on the evils of clipped silver, he comments, "Like all strong general averments this probably overstates the case." Accordingly, he is forever making allowances for the rhetorical narrator and the over-excited witness. To withstand always the historian's constant temptation to overstate and overcolor, to discover and to tell the plain truth—this is, clearly, his resolve. To write history after such a fashion demands a firm will, and a rather rare kind of honesty, requiring the sacrifice of many opportunities for effects which most readers crave and most writers strive incessantly to accomplish. It is improbable that any paragraph in these five volumes will ever be singled out for any quality that catches the eye. Mr. Rhodes is never brilliant, never the fine writer.

Yet one hesitates to pronounce his work lacking in what we call literary quality. When we consider it from that point of view, many strictures do, no doubt, suggest themselves. Mr. Rhodes's prose is not imaginative. Fancy, grace, tenderness are wanting. Few phrases strike one as particularly fit or fine. The pace is slow, and it never changes. Mr. Rhodes moves through the most exciting episodes quite as he plods over the most matter-of-fact reaches of his narrative. His battle-pieces are disappointing. The style is heavy, the constructions, though rarely defective, are sometimes rather clumsy—with the not unpleasing clumsiness of the muscle-bound athlete. But when these

specific criticisms have been assembled, an awkward fact stands in the way of a dissatisfied general verdict: one has found the book, after all, decidedly readable. The author's candor and sincerity and thoroughness, his great appetite for truth, his deep, masculine interest in his subject—these things far outweigh his mainly negative infelicities. We know that Mr. Rhodes has not neglected to study methods in historiography; on the contrary, he has with his customary care and patience examined the ways of the masters, from Herodotus down. May he not have been wise to choose for himself the style and manner which he finds most natural, most expressive of his own everyday standards of judgment and of taste?

At any rate, he has made a thoroughly American book. In that respect, it is comparable to General Grant's *Memoirs*. He has written history very much as Grant and Sherman,—like himself, men of the middle West,—made it. There are doubtless better fashions in narrative prose, but for this particular narrative none, surely, could be more appropriate. Suppose Mr. Rhodes had elected to tell his story in the manner of our most distinctly literary personages—Mr. Barrett Wendell, for example, or Mr. Henry James! There are books which might be spoiled by a pronounced literary flavor, and this is one of them. It is certainly desirable that a history of the United States be written in a language which the mass of Americans can readily understand.

Were there space for more reflection, there is food for it in the fact that even to such a history as this, a history of the most absorbing years of all our past, the mass of Americans seem as yet woefully indifferent. Quite possibly, there are as yet more Americans laudably busy with writing about our past than there are eager purchasers and readers of their books. I say "as yet", because it seems hardly probable that this state of things will continue, or that this so worthy book of Mr. Rhodes will not, sooner or later, win for itself a public somewhat commensurate with the favor it has won from the critics. Apart from all its other merits, it has one quality that insures it permanence of value. It can no more be superseded than Grant's *Memoirs*; for to future generations it will have the character of a contemporary document relating to all the great events of the Civil War period. Other histories may in various ways surpass it, but none can ever take its place. Mr. Rhodes is forever fortunate in standing at what is perhaps the very best distance from his subject.

But even if this were not so, one would hate to believe that his countrymen are too absorbed in their present-day affairs, which it is hard to find inspiring, to attend to this dignified recital of so much that is inspiring and heroic in their still recent past. Let us hope, therefore, that Mr. Rhodes, now that his case with the scholarly is won, may make a few concessions to those whom the very air and method of scholarship affrights. Perhaps he will some day find time to prepare a popular edition, divested of all notes that are merely references to authorities, the text cleared of citations that convince but do not interest, the whole

lessened in bulk and unified in narrative effect. In some such form the work might go directly into the hands of a great number who will otherwise profit by Mr. Rhodes's labors only through other men's books. But in any case it will doubtless long remain the source from which students will draw, whether at first hand or at second hand, their soundest knowledge of the great American conflict.

W. G. BROWN.

MINOR NOTICES

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, New Series, Volume XVIII. (London, 1905, pp. 391). Among the papers read before the Royal Historical Society in 1904 the address by the president, Dr. G. W. Prothero, and the study by Colonel E. M. Lloyd on Canning and Spanish America are of especial interest to American readers. In his presidential address Dr. Prothero gives an interesting survey of the status of recent history in the curricula of English colleges and universities. Contrary to the practice on the Continent and in America, the field of modern history since the Congress of Vienna has been entirely neglected in England. At Oxford the line has been sharply drawn at 1815 for foreign history, and at 1837 for domestic. For the period after these dates no instruction was provided,¹ and a man at Oxford might obtain the highest honors in history and know nothing of "Louis Philippe or Napoleon III., of Lincoln or Bismarck or Cavour, of the American Civil War or the making of the German Empire". At his own university, Cambridge, Dr. Prothero considers the instruction in nineteenth-century history likewise quite inadequate, and while conditions are slightly better at London and Manchester, the subject receives much less attention in England than on the Continent or in the United States. Dr. Prothero's address should be read in connection with Professor Andrews's paper on Recent European History in American Colleges; P. Caron and Th. Sagnac, *Études d' Histoire Moderne en France*, and the first part of the careful study by M. Lot, *L'Enseignement de l'Histoire et de l'Art dans les Universités d'Allemagne et de France*.

Colonel Lloyd's study of Canning and Spanish America calls to mind Mr. H. W. V. Temperley's *Life of Canning* which has just appeared. The difference in the attitude of the two men toward Canning is interesting; the biographer, as one would expect, being much more sympathetic. Indeed Colonel Lloyd seems to emphasize rather unduly what Croker called the insincerity of the great statesman. A well-constructed paper by Miss Enid M. G. Routh on "The Attempts to establish a Balance of Power" (1648-1702), represents the successful work for the Alexander Prize. It would seem as if an investigation into a subject in which the ambitions of France played so conspicuous

¹ In a footnote Dr. Prothero states that the area of study included in the Honours School of Modern History at Oxford has since the date of his address been extended to include the years from 1815 to 1878.

a part should furnish a more detailed analysis of the provisions relating to that country in the treaties of Westphalia, than the simple footnote, "by the Peace of Westphalia France gained Metz, Toul and Verdun and rights to certain cities." Of decidedly standard calibre are the paper by Miss R. Graham on "The Finance of Malton Priory, 1244-1257," and the scholarly study by Dr. Edwin F. Gay on "The Midland Revolt and the Inquisitions of Depopulation of 1607." The papers by Dr. James Gairdner and Mr. I. S. Leadam on the conspiracy against Henry VII., which Mr. Leadam, in a paper before the society in 1903, claimed to have discovered, are keen and clear-cut, affording an excellent illustration of the criticism of sources. Dr. Gairdner makes a strong case against what he calls "the supposed conspiracy." Mr. A. Denton Cheney contributes a paper on the Holy Maid of Kent, and Mr. G. J. Turner on the Minority of Henry III. (Pt. 1) concludes the historical part of the volume.

It is a matter of regret that the project of a bibliography of English history since 1485, set out so clearly by Dr. Prothero in his previous address, has apparently not developed sufficiently to call for a report of progress.

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.

In *Evidence in Athenian Courts* (University of Chicago Press, 1905), Mr. R. J. Bonner, "formerly of the Ontario Bar", deals with the subject from the point of view of a man trained in English law. The material is classified accordingly under such heads as Irrelevant, Hearsay, Written, Oral, Real, and Expert Evidence, Evidence of Slaves, Competency of Witnesses, Challenges, Oaths, etc. In a number of cases the view presented in Meier-Schömann's *Der Attische Process* is disputed. For example, the writer maintains that prior to the time of Isæus the evidence of witnesses was oral, and that in late times when it was required to be reduced to writing the depositions were not necessarily filed at the preliminary examination, but could be deposited with the clerk of the court at any time before they were read. Further it is held that a slave even in cases of murder could not be a witness, technically speaking; and that the information obtained from slaves by torture could only be considered evidence if the torture followed the formal challenge. The work is carefully done, and will be found interesting and suggestive by teachers who have not had the advantage of a legal training.

A. G. L.

Homenaje à D. Francisco Codera en su Jubilación del Profesorado. Estudios de Erudición Oriental, con una introducción de D. Eduardo Saavedra. (Zaragoza, Mariano Escar, 1904, pp. xxxviii, 656.) This volume is at once a deserved tribute to an estimable scholar and an illustration of the revival in Spain of interest in Semitic studies. Spain is the natural custodian and expounder of the extensive and interesting Arabic and Hebrew literature of the peninsula, but for a long time she

neglected her duty in this regard. Bitter hatred of Moors and Jews in the sixteenth century and political decadence in the seventeenth century, followed by harassing wars, quenched enthusiasm for linguistic and historical studies; up to near the middle of the nineteenth century Spaniards had done little for the treasures of the Escorial library or for the history and literature of the Spanish Moors. The last sixty years, however, have brought about a gratifying change in this regard. Under the leadership of Pascual de Gayangos and others keen interest in the Spanish-Arabic civilization has been awakened, and a host of scholars have devoted themselves to Semitic philology and history (and, it may be added, the valuable Arabic library collected by P. de Gayangos has been secured for Spain). Among these scholars Codera occupies an important place. Born in Fonz in 1836, and intending at first to enter the Church, he was led by circumstances (not affecting his religious faith) to devote himself to the physical sciences, and later to classical and Semitic philology. In 1874 he obtained the chair of Arabic in the University of Madrid, and from that time till his jubilee year (1902) gave himself with ardor and perseverance to the study of Spanish-Moslem history, especially its numismatics and chronology. He has contributed more than a hundred articles to learned journals on numismatic, epigraphic, historical and bibliographical subjects, and has edited the ten volumes (Vols. II., IX., X., in conjunction with Professor Ribera, of Saragossa) of the important *Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana*, which contains numerous biographical notices of the learned men of Andalusia, besides other matters of interest; the manuscripts edited are, all but one, in the Escorial library. In addition to his contributions to Spanish-Moslem history Codera has aided the cause of learning by his influence on his pupils and on the scholars of Spain. The present volume contains thirty-eight papers on Arabic subjects contributed by Semitic scholars of Europe, America and Egypt; of the contributors twenty-four are Spanish, six French, two Italian, one Portuguese, one German, one Dutch, one Danish, one American (Professor Macdonald, of Hartford) and one Egyptian. The papers cover a great variety of matters, and the volume is a valuable addition to our Arabic material. One of the most interesting discussions is that of Barrau-Dihigo, of the library of the University of Paris, who enters the lists in defence of Conde. As is well known, the reputation of Conde's *History of the Domination of the Arabs in Spain* has been almost completely demolished by the attacks of P. de Gayangos and the Leiden Professor Dozy; the latter denounced him as an ignoramus, forger and impostor. The object of this paper is to show that Dozy's charges are exaggerated and unjust, that Conde, though not always exact, was a learned and serious scholar, drawing his material from original sources. The proofs offered by Barrau-Dihigo are definite enough to warrant a revision of the general contemptuous opinion of Conde; Dozy himself, in the second edition of his *Recherches*, suppressed his polemic against him.

C. H. T.

The Progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire, by John Pentland Mahaffy, C.V.O., D.D., D.C.L. Chicago. (University of Chicago Press, 1905, pp. vii, 154.) In this volume are published six lectures originally delivered in the University of Chicago and now addressed "to the general reader, the specialist, and the student or teacher of Christianity." They deal in an entertaining way with a great period, the one in which Greek culture was prepared for universal empire. Professor Mahaffy is well qualified to do justice to it, by long study and by possessing in an eminent degree the historian's high gift of sympathy with every serious human movement, however grievous its inception or ominous its outcome. He here strives to see things as a whole, to distinguish Greek and Macedonian and to show them at work among the "beautiful, gentle, laborious people" of Egypt and the vast, silent multitude of Asia, to determine the Hellenistic influences which surrounded nascent Christianity, and to discover—in Ireland and elsewhere—modern analogies for ancient actions and present-day survivals of ancient ideas.

There is little in the book (beyond novelty of presentation) which cannot be found elsewhere. There is, indeed, an over-insistence upon notions which we have come to recognize as peculiarly Mahaffyan. Profound or conclusive the book is not, and the occasion did not demand a different work. But it is less excusable that it treats too exclusively of problems of the author's own raising, too little of those current at the present time. And this, perhaps, explains the rather surprising assertion that the period he has chosen for his discourses is still "somewhat neglected".

W. S. FERGUSON.

Minores and Mediocres in the Germanic Tribal Laws, by Edgar Holmes McNeal (Columbus, Ohio, Press of F. J. Heer, 1905, pp. 139). This doctor's dissertation is a study of the Burgundian, Alemannian, Lombard, Visigothic, and Bavarian codes to show that the growth of royalty and other changed conditions, especially economic, to which the Germanic peoples were subjected after migration, led to a profound change in the class of freemen: through acquirement of much land or royal favor or both, certain freemen, *mediocres*, were becoming distinguished from the ordinary freemen, *minores*; the tribal blood-nobility was disappearing; the *mediocres*, *mediani*, *medii*, were the new class appearing between the old nobility and the smaller freeholders. The general idea is of course a familiar one in the classical works on German institutions. This monograph shows the variations of the process in the different tribes, to what special and local forces the freemen were subjected in each case, with a very careful study of the terminology found. In some details of interpretative criticism it differs from the accepted authorities, but this leads to no important divergence on the general proposition. The introductory chapter (thirty-six pages) serves no useful purpose: it contains nothing new to the scholar of the period

and would not be useful as a reference in undergraduate instruction. The word feudal is used loosely throughout; almost every change is regarded as working towards feudalism, there being no attempt to limit that term to its strict institutional application. On the basis of its contribution to knowledge the work scarcely justifies the labor evidently expended.

A. B. WHITE.

Die Kaiserinnengräber in Andria, von Arthur Haseloff, [Bibliothek des Kgl. Preussischen Historischen Instituts in Rom, Band I.] (Rom, 1905, pp. viii, 61, with nine plates). The Prussian Historical Institute at Rome issues this as the first volume of a new series which is to contain studies that are too long for its Review, *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, and yet do not belong with its larger works. The present volume contains an examination of the evidence regarding the graves found in the crypt of the Cathedral of Andria in 1904 and supposed to be those of the empresses Yolande and Isabella. After discussing the sources and the statements and traditions of later times, the author passes to the archaeological evidence found in the cathedral itself. The upper church of today dates mainly from the fifteenth century; but there are remains from the time of Frederick II., when it was, quite surely, rebuilt. The lower church,—technically not a crypt,—has been altered at various times; but it dates as a whole from before the development of the romanesque cathedral in Apulia. A careful examination of the graves brings the author to the conclusion that, while they were found where tradition places those of the empresses and while there may be enough evidence for probability, there is certainly not enough to prove that they are the tombs of Yolande and Isabella. The examination of the lower church produces little effect with respect to the problem at issue, but brings to light important material for the history of Apulian architecture and ornamentation in the Hohenstaufen period.

The essay is well proportioned; and with its clear, sane treatment and ample illustration is a valuable contribution to the history of art in medieval Apulia.

A. C. T.

Scandinavia: A Political History of Denmark, Norway and Sweden from 1513 to 1900. By R. Nisbet Bain. (Cambridge, University Press, 1905, pp. viii, 448.) Students of European history have long felt the need of some good English account of modern Scandinavia. This need has been supplied in part by Mr. Bain's recently published history of the North, a volume of the Cambridge Historical Series. As Mr. Bain views it, "the political history of Scandinavia is the history of the frustration of a great Baltic Empire". It is the story, then, of the imperial ambitions of Denmark and Sweden in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the author wishes to recount. Beginning with the accession of Christian II. in 1513 he traces the gradual decline of Danish

power, the swift rise of Sweden under the Vasas, and the final collapse in the reign of Charles XII. Of these two centuries the author gives us a splendid narrative. In his conclusions he frequently differs from earlier writers, but, though his generalizations are often dangerously bold, his statements, as a rule, are well supported. By the use of Slavic sources he has been able to supplement and correct Swedish history on numerous points. But when Mr. Bain closes his chapter on Charles XII. his subject is practically exhausted. To the remaining period of nearly two centuries he devotes less than one hundred pages. Compared with the earlier part of the work the closing chapters are of inferior quality.

In a history of this kind the author naturally has to deal principally with camps and courts. On the institutional side his work is anything but strong. Perhaps Mr. Bain considers constitutional development foreign to his plan and purpose; nevertheless, certain institutions must be noted and explained if the reader is to understand the narrative. Such an institution is the "Senate" of which we hear repeatedly, but of the origin and composition of which we are told almost nothing. With Norway the author deals to such a slight extent that one hardly understands why the name of that country is included in the title. The great intellectual movements in Norway during the past century—movements that have had a profound influence on recent Scandinavian politics—receive no attention.

Strictly Scandinavian problems the author usually discusses from a Swedish point of view; especially do his pro-Swedish sympathies appear in his treatment of contemporary politics. In the eleven pages that Mr. Bain devotes to the history of Norway and Sweden from 1814 to 1903, his principal topic is the conflict that culminated in the events of last June. His account seems to be an excellent summary of the Swedish side of the conflict, but it is not history. The statement that Sweden conceded a separate consular service for Norway in 1903 (p. 442) is somewhat misleading, as no steps were ever taken to fulfill the promise.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Origines Islandicae. A Collection of the More Important Sagas and Other Native Writings relating to the Settlement and Early History of Iceland. Edited and translated by Gudbrand Vigfusson and F. York Powell. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1905, two volumes, pp. xiv, 728, vii, 787.) The purpose of the editors of this collection has been to make accessible to English readers the principal sources of early Icelandic history. These are mainly of the saga type, though laws, charters, and a few poetic fragments have also been included. In editing these materials Dr. Vigfusson and Professor Powell have followed the same principles and employed the same methods as in preparing their edition of Old Norse poetry, the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*. The original text in its earliest form is given in nearly every instance, and a literal trans-

lation carefully prepared is usually added. Preceding each text is a critical introduction of particular value, in which the editors discuss the various problems connected with the saga, both historical and textual. In the first volume the materials are grouped under the heads of settlement, the old constitution, and the early church. Colonial life is the principal theme of the second volume. From a score of splendid tales the editors have collected a mass of material illustrating life, custom and culture not only in Iceland but in the North and Britain as well. The fifth book, which contains the account of the Wineland voyages, will be of special interest to American students. As the texts of the Wineland sagas are accessible elsewhere, the translations alone are given here.

The great masters who planned the work and prepared the larger part of it both died before their task was finished. Excellent though the volumes are in almost every respect, the work remains in a measure incomplete. The reader has to refer continually to the corrigenda, a formidable list noting more than five hundred errors and omissions. In the preface to Book V., we are told that "Section 3 is taken up with geographical notices, annalistica, statistics, charters, and the like, referring to Greenland and Wineland down to 1406." It is disappointing to find that these promising materials do not appear in this or any other section. Evidently the editor who finally prepared the work for publication should have been better acquainted with its contents.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Sir Archibald Lawrie has brought together, under the title *Early Scottish Charters* (Glasgow, MacLehose, 1905, pp. xxix, 515), two hundred and seventy-two documents ranging in date from the middle of the tenth to the middle of the twelfth centuries, but belonging naturally, for the more part, to the last fifty years of the period. The editor, in making this collection, is in fact carrying out a plan that was framed as early as 1800 by the Deputy-Keeper of the Records of Scotland, but was abandoned before it could be brought to completion. The abundant publications of learned societies since that time have considerably lightened Sir Archibald's labors and he has been able to gather most of his material from the volumes of the Surtees Society, the Bannatyne Club, the Maitland Club, and other similar quarters. Still he has not been unmindful of the present passion for the inedited and his book will be found to contain sixteen documents printed from manuscript. For the convenience of those who may make use of the work we give the numbers of the documents in question (LI, LVI-LX, XCVIII, CXII-CXV, CLXXI, CLXXXVI, CLXXXVII, CC, CCXXII), but we hasten to add that this is the only convenience which the editor has omitted to supply. There is an elaborate table of contents so disposed as to be virtually a calendar of the documents, and better still, a positively affluent index referring to the notes as well as to the text. The notes themselves occupy more than half the volume and are of somewhat unequal value. They tend at moments to irrelevancy and are not

without arbitrary judgments and appeals to *verba magistri*. But these faults are very apparent and will be easily recognized and allowed for by those who have occasion to make use of the volume. We have then only gratitude to the editor for the patience and learning which he has devoted to a work that will ease the labors of many who come after him.

G. T. L.

Les Sources de l'Histoire de France, par Auguste Molinier. Tome V. Introduction Générale (pp. i-clxxxvi); Les Valois (*suite*), Louis XI. et Charles VIII. (1461-94), pp. 1-196. (Paris, Picard, 1904.) There is a melancholy interest attached to the fifth volume of the late M. Auguste Molinier's *Les Sources de l'Histoire de France*, which has to deal with the reigns of Louis XI. and Charles VIII. (1461-94). Its production was the last work of the author's life. Fortunately, the gifted scholar was spared long enough to complete the *Introduction Générale* which precedes the more bibliographical portion of the volume. The manuscript of this preface, the reading of which irresistibly recalls the epithet applied to those of Bishop Stubbs in the Rolls Series, was finished on March 16, 1904; two months later, on May 19, M. Molinier died. This information is gleaned from a prefatory note inserted by M. Charles Bémont, under whose editorial supervision the volume was issued from the press.

Those who are familiar with the preceding volumes will recognize again the same breadth and thoroughness as before. Only in a sense the materials here elucidated have greater value, for the reason that the reign of Louis XI. yet awaits the pen of the historian who will treat it as M. Luchaire has treated the period of the Capetians, or as the Marquis de Beaucourt has written the history of the reign of Charles VII.

But the peculiar, unique value of this volume, as intimated, is in the introduction of M. Molinier. These 187 pages constitute at once an historiographical survey and a sketch of the history of civilization in France in the Middle Ages. One has a renewed sense of reverence for the traditions and ideals of scholarship who reads this noble discourse. A complete index of the five volumes is promised for the near future. The modern portions of the series are in preparation, that pertaining to the history of France from 1715 to 1789 being already in press.

J. W. T.

The Letters of Dorothy Wadham, 1609-1618 (London, Henry Frowde, 1904, pp. viii, 89) were originally intended as a companion volume to Mr. Graham Jackson's *Wadham College*. Although the editor, Rev. Robert Barlow Gardiner, laments that circumstances prevented the work from appearing in the stately form at first designed, the volume before us is certainly a most attractive piece of book-making. The letters and documents, some forty in number, together

with the introduction, notes, and appendices, give an interesting picture of the foundation and early administration of the college. They likewise reveal to us the foundress—acting as the executrix of her deceased husband, Nicholas Wadham, Esquire, of Merifield, Somerset—as a capable and benevolent, though withal somewhat arbitrary personality, in a day when the emancipated woman was a rarity. Nevertheless, to be a contemporary of Queen Elizabeth involved some responsibility.

A. L. C.

Professor Charles Sanford Terry, who during the last five or six years has shown a marked activity in exploiting post-Restoration Scottish history, gives in *The Pentland Rising and Rullion Green* (Glasgow, James MacLehose and Sons, 1905, pp. 90) a detailed account of the outbreak, movements, and catastrophe of the abortive rising of the Whigs in 1666. While the causes and results of the affair are passed over on the ground that they have already been sufficiently discussed by previous historians, the exhaustive and well-documented narrative constitutes a distinct if minute contribution. One point which Mr. Terry seems to settle conclusively is, that while general causes of discontent existed, and while the Scots of the south-western counties may have been in communication with their co-religionists in England and Ireland, the actual outbreak was unpremeditated, that it was occasioned by the chance "scuffle at Dalry" on November 13. Two excellent maps, one tracing the routes of the insurgents and the royal forces, November 13-28, the other illustrating the battle of Rullion Green, greatly enhance the value of the work.

A. L. C.

The Records of a Scottish Cloth Manufactory at New Mills, Haddingtonshire, 1681-1703. Edited from the original manuscripts, with introduction and notes, by W. R. Scott. [Publications of the Scottish History Society, Vol. XLVI.] (Edinburgh, T. and A. Constable, 1905, pp. xci, 366.) The Scottish History Society, from its beginning in 1886, has repeatedly manifested its interest in the economic side of Scottish history. It has published several account-books, notably those of a Dundee merchant (1587-1630) and of Sir John Foulis (1671-1707), and it now issues an even more valuable contribution in the minutes for 1681-1691 and 1701-1703 of the business transacted by the managers of an important manufacturing company. The papers of the New Mills Company here presented, covering almost half of its total existence, are of exceptional significance, since records of manufacturing undertakings of this period are exceedingly scarce. The Society has been fortunate in finding an editor who by his recent articles in the *Scottish Historical Review* and by his present performance has shown himself well qualified as a student of Scottish economic history. In his introduction to this volume Mr. Scott treats concisely but competently the cloth-trade in

Scotland during the seventeenth century, the part played by the joint-stock company in the industrial revival in Scotland towards the end of the century, and the history of the New Mills Company. He appends an early prospectus of 1681 and the "great contract", the original articles of copartnership.

Some of the information yielded by the records, printed in full or in excerpts in the text, is well summarized in the introduction, but the student should consult the text itself for much additional detail, and especially for light on the form of industrial organization. The index, particularly the caption "New Mills Company", will be found a satisfactory guide.

EDWIN F. GAY.

Adam Smith. By Francis W. Hirst. [English Men of Letters]. (London and New York, Macmillan, 1904, pp. viii, 240.) The publication in 1896 of the notes of Adam Smith's lectures on justice, police, revenue and arms answered the question of how far he had developed his system of economics before he came into direct contact with the Physiocrats during his travels in France. Mr. Hirst has therefore been able to write positively upon this important point concerning which previous biographers could express only more or less well supported opinions. Aside from this it has not been possible to add anything of note to our meagre knowledge of the great economist, knowledge already exhaustively presented in Rae's life of Smith. Nor was it to be expected that Mr. Hirst would discuss as suggestively as have some others Smith's place in the development of philosophy and economics. It may fairly be said, however, that he has succeeded in presenting a picture of Smith as a man, remarkably vivid in view of the scantiness of the material available, and in making his sketch more readable than any we have had before. He brings out with special clearness Smith's interest in the great political and economic problems of the time, particularly the colonial problem, and his close relation as counsellor with the statesmen of his day. Indeed it is a distinct service of this little book, which will doubtless be more generally read than any other life of Smith, that no reader can leave it with the false impression of Smith as a closet philosopher interested only in questions of ethical or economic theory. The impression constantly forced upon the reader is that of a man of philosophic mind and encyclopaedic learning, but also of a man, during the latter part of his life at least, primarily interested in practical affairs, of keen powers of observation, and a remarkable faculty for interpreting, and generalizing from, the facts of history and the world.

Meagre as are the materials from which the story of Smith's life must be constructed, they are sufficient to afford a picture of the man and his work which would probably not be altered, or greatly increased in definiteness, by a much fuller knowledge of detail.

Les Troubles de Hollande à la Veille de la Révolution Française (1780-1795), par Henry de Peyster, Docteur ès Lettres (Paris, Picard,

1905, pp. xvi, 340). The Dutch Republic was in the years indicated a relatively unimportant part of Europe. The event showed that its strength was slight. But as a rich and helpless prey to the machinations of the great powers, and as the seat of a population which did much for the development of civil liberty and of democratic sentiment in the eighteenth century, it has a place of considerable importance and interest in the history of those critical times. The years with which Dr. de Peyster deals most fully, 1783-1787, from the struggle over the Scheldt to the Prussian invasion and the Triple Alliance, have already been treated with great completeness by Dr. H. T. Colenbrander in his three volumes entitled *De Patriottentijd*. But that masterly work is, for reasons of language, known to but few readers, and it is well worth while to present a narrative of the fifteen years in a language more accessible. Dr. de Peyster shows less maturity than his eminent predecessor. He does not escape, and perhaps no one can escape, the difficulties inherent in the history of a loose federal republic, where unity of narrative is often not to be obtained but by ignoring the actual complexity of affairs. His initial chapter, "Les Moeurs", a minute description of Dutch social life and traits as they existed about 1780, is vivid and entertaining, but does not really afford enough aid toward understanding the subsequent chapters of political history to justify its length and its position. The next two introductory chapters however ("L'Organisation Intérieure" and "Les Partis et les Hommes") are directly and in a very full sense valuable, presenting an excellent account of the Dutch government and parties in the last years of the Republic, and careful and impartial portraits of the chief leaders. The author's researches have been exceedingly thorough, ranging through the extensive printed literature, through various Dutch archives, public and private, and through the archives of Paris, London, Brussels, Berlin and Vienna. His narrative is fair, minutely careful, interesting and well-written, without being exceptionally vivid. It is based on a competent knowledge of the general European situation. There is an excellent account of the sources, and several useful appendixes, one of which contains a number of characteristic letters of Frederick the Great to his niece the Princess of Orange, additional to those printed by Dr. Colenbrander.

Select Documents Illustrative of the History of the French Revolution. The Constituent Assembly, edited by L. G. Wickham Legg, M.A. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1905, two volumes, pp. xviii, 335, iv, 297.) The editor of these handy volumes has performed a valuable service for students of the French Revolution. In pursuance of a well conceived plan, wherein any strictly contemporaneous writing is regarded as a document, he has chosen from the enormous mass of available material upwards of four hundred documents, all of which are valuable and many of them hitherto generally inaccessible. Nearly all of the documents belong to one or another of three distinct classes: extracts from Paris newspapers; decrees, addresses to the king, royal speeches, and other

official papers from the *procès-verbaux* of the Constituent Assembly; miscellaneous documents bearing upon the fall of the Bastille, the October days, the flight to Varennes, and the affair of the Champ de Mars, drawn principally from the *procès-verbaux* of the municipalities of Paris and Varennes. Letters, pamphlets, and the debates in the Assembly have been excluded, owing to their extent, relatively inferior value, or accessibility in other collections. The principal feature, both in bulk and value, is the newspaper extracts. The larger number of these consist rather more of comment than of narrative and afford an opportunity for considerable first-hand study of public opinion. For the earlier period the extracts are drawn chiefly from Mirabeau's periodicals; for the later periods, from a great variety of newspapers, principally weeklies. The *Mercure de France*, the *Révolutions de Paris*, and the *Révolutions de France et de Brabant* are most largely represented. The introduction contains an excellent concise account of the principal newspapers; short explanatory comments, together with a few references, accompany many of the documents; twenty-four pages are given to brief biographical notes, while seven appendixes furnish the full text of the principal constructive acts of the Constituent Assembly.

Along with numerous capital features there are some grave defects. The finding apparatus is not what it should be. The table of contents lists only groups of documents and gives the pages only for nine large divisions, into which the smaller groups are combined. Even the index, although excellent for minutiae within the documents, often fails to give any assistance to one in search of a particular document. In the choice of materials the value of the collection would have been greatly enhanced if some of the numerous documents dealing with minor disorders and measures of only temporary importance had been omitted and the space utilized for more numerous, more varied, and more extended newspaper comments upon the great destructive and constructive measures of the Constituent Assembly. Some effort to represent public opinion in the provinces ought also to have been made. The most serious defect, however, is the tone of the editorial comments. The editor is altogether certain that he can distinguish the wise and the unwise, the good and the bad, the selfish and the unselfish, in almost any event or measure. The dogmatic manner and the partisan spirit which mark these comments are particularly out of place in a work which will probably find its chief use among university students.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

The Philosophers and the French Revolution, by P. A. Wadia (London, Sonnenschein; New York, Scribner, pp. 127). In the words of the author, "This small treatise is intended to tackle the question how far the eighteenth-century writers in France can be made responsible, directly or indirectly, for the outbreak of the French Revolution, in whatever sense the term French Revolution is understood." After showing the general prevalence, even among historians, of the idea that the Revo-

lution was due to the writings of the philosophers, Mr. Wadia demonstrates the unsoundness of this view. In the first place, there was no republican party previous to 1792, as Aulard has shown, although there were republican ideas, but these ideas existed and were widely propagated in France before the so-called philosophers had begun to write, so that the philosophers instead of being the cause were only the manifestation of the revolutionary spirit. Again, it is shown that the Revolution was only a part of that movement to "emancipate the individual from the trammels of tradition and authority" that began with the Renaissance and was continued by the Reformation; in France, this work of freeing the individual was carried through to the end, "knowingly or unknowingly," by the eighteenth-century writers. But in all that they wrote, they simply reflected the ideas and sentiments of the clergy and nobility and the wealthy bourgeoisie. "Instead of being so many prophets and preachers of a new gospel, they were the priests, as it were, of the Genius of the French Nobility and Bourgeoisie who gave forth to the world the inspirations of their master." This is the substance of the argument.

The principal thesis that the revolutionary ideas did not originate with the philosophers is true but not new, having been demonstrated convincingly by Rocquain, Aubertin and others. Mr. Wadia's volume will, undoubtedly, serve to popularize this view among English readers. He is inclined to minimize the influence of the writings of the philosophers and to exaggerate their lack of independence of the court and of the nobility. Nor does he lay sufficient emphasis upon the struggle between the monarchy and the parliaments, the chief centre of revolutionary activity.

To discuss intelligently the relation of the writings of the philosophers to the Revolution, it is primarily necessary to fix the meaning of the latter term. In 1789, the majority of intelligent Frenchmen were in favor of substituting a government based upon law for the arbitrary government that existed in France. Such a change was clearly revolutionary, as can be seen from a like movement that is going on in Russia to-day. While this movement was not originally republican, while it became so only through the opposition of the king and the privileged classes to reasonable reform, and while it did not originate with the philosophers, they certainly played a most important part in formulating the claims of the nations and in propagating the revolutionary ideas. In correcting one-sided views there is danger, at times, of "throwing out the child with the bath".

FRED MORROW FLING.

La Cour et le Règne de Paul I^{er}; Portraits, Souvenirs, et Anecdotes, par le Comte Fédor Golovkine. (Paris, Plon.) This is distinctly a disappointing work, for at first sight it looks promising. Count Golovkine was very much a man of the world who, in the course of long and varied experiences, saw, at short range, a good many notable

people, including Catharine II., Paul, Napoleon, Metternich, etc. As he himself was by temperament an eighteenth-century cosmopolitan, and in the great events of his day was a spectator rather than an actor, we might have hoped to obtain from him, if not new facts of prime importance, at least fresh light on the men and the doings of his time. Unfortunately, his opportunities have borne but little fruit. His portraits, though sometimes of interest, are not at all convincing, besides being almost always ill-natured. His souvenirs are inaccurate, so much so that his editor repeatedly feels called upon to correct them, and we should be sorry to accept any statement on Count Golovkine's sole authority. His anecdotes and his bon mots, on which latter he obviously prides himself, are in the great majority of cases neither clever nor amusing. Altogether the memoirs impress one as commonplace enough, and betray the vanity of the author rather than any particular keenness of observation on his part. Perhaps the best portion of the book is that not very large one covered by the title: namely, his description of the court life during the reign of the unfortunate Emperor Paul. It tallies well with what was already known on the subject and is at least quite readable. The introduction and the notes by Mr. S. Bonnet are careful and scholarly, if not particularly illuminating.

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

Miss Agnes C. Laut at the beginning of her *Pathfinders of the West* (Macmillan, pp. xxv, 389) issues this challenge: "The question will at once occur why no mention is made of Marquette, Jolliet, and La Salle in a work on the pathfinders of the West. The simple answer is—they were *not* pathfinders. Contrary to the notions imbibed at school and repeated in all histories of the West, Marquette, Jolliet, and La Salle did not discover the vast region beyond the Great Lakes." To which assertion it may be answered, then why not begin with Jean Nicolet, who was the first to penetrate the region between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi; or why omit Brulé who is the probable discoverer of Lake Superior? And why charge *all* historians with ignoring Radisson and Groseillers, when Winsor credits them with the discovery of the Mississippi? Is not the answer to be found in the meaning attached to the words used? If we grant that Radisson was the first to reach the upper waters of the great river, still he was not a pathfinder, because that term would imply that he opened the way for others, whereas it was Marquette and Joliet who really discovered the pathway to the Mississippi, just as it was La Salle who explored that river to its mouth. Their discoveries immediately became matters of common knowledge, and were followed by traffic and missionary effort. On the other hand Radisson's travels were made known not to the French, but to the English, and it is only since the Prince Society published Radisson's *Voyages*, in 1885, that writers of history have known of his explorations. So, too, Radisson was the first to describe the shores of Lake Superior; but Mesnard sailed those waters before Radisson did,

and Mesnard's letters were published before Radisson's account got into print. And even in the case of Mesnard, that zealous priest found two nameless Frenchmen at his journey's end; so that one must be cautious in the matter of claiming actual discovery for any particular person.

But whatever we may decide as to Miss Laut's theory as to the Mississippi and Lake Superior discoveries, two facts remain: first, Radisson and Groseillers were pathfinders—in the real sense—to Hudson Bay; and, secondly, the author has made a readable translation of much of Radisson's narrative. The term translation is used advisedly; for the Frenchman wrote in a language that, pretending to be English, is not that tongue or any other. And her additional chapters on De La Verendrye's and on Lewis and Clark's discoveries are most entertaining.

Documentary History of Dunmore's War, 1774, compiled from the Draper Manuscripts in the Library of the Wisconsin Historical Society, and published at the charge of the Wisconsin Society of Sons of the American Revolution; edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites, LL.D., Secretary of the Society, and Louise Phelps Kellogg, Ph.D. (Madison, 1905, pp. xxviii, 472). The genesis of this volume is sufficiently explained by the title-page. But, when so many of the patriotic-hereditary societies do so little in the way of historical publication of a kind permanently valuable, one must spare a little space to commend the public spirit of this Wisconsin society, who have perceived the superior claims of documentary publication over all other varieties, for societies of their class, and have subsidized this valuable and interesting collection. Dr. Draper's accumulations of manuscript, especially the papers of Col. William Preston, county-lieutenant and sheriff of Fincastle, have afforded an unusual opportunity to illustrate, with great fullness and variety, a particular episode of great importance to the early history of the West and of the Revolution. The many documents are annotated carefully and with intelligence. It is interesting to see that the editors reject the ancient accusations frequently made against Lord Dunmore in connection with this Indian expedition.

Disunion Sentiment in Congress in 1794. A Confidential Memorandum hitherto unpublished, written by John Taylor of Caroline, Senator from Virginia, for James Madison. Edited, with an Introduction, by Gaillard Hunt. (Washington, Lowdermilk, pp. 23.) Published in a limited edition, this pamphlet contains a confidential memorandum which John Taylor of Caroline wrote for Madison shortly after the conversation which it records. It was not included among the Madison Papers bought by the government, nor in the McGuire collection. Separately preserved by Mrs. Madison and her nephew, it has fallen into the hands of its present publishers. It is interesting and important. The conversation which it relates took place early in May, 1794, shortly before the end of Taylor's first service in the Senate, and when he had already

signified his intention of resigning. Rufus King, he relates (and Taylor, though narrow, was a very honest man) sought an interview with him, in which Senator Ellsworth, as though casually, soon joined. They represented to him that the divergent interests of East and South made continuance of the Union impossible, and asked him to engage in plans for a peaceable dissolution. Taylor counselled further efforts to remove mutual suspicion, by moderate measures as to the debt, the army, etc., but found the two Federalist senators indisposed to adopt his suggestions. Madison has added to the memorandum the words: "The language of K. and E. probably in terrorem." This may be the proper explanation of the episode. Statesmen designing to dissolve a federal union would not naturally and without *arrière pensée* consult at an early stage of their preparations one of the most doctrinaire of their opponents. But that the purpose may none the less have been genuine will not be denied by anyone who has read, for instance, the document printed in this REVIEW, IV. 329.

Mr. Hunt is not happy in his treatment of Jefferson's well-known letter to Taylor, dated June 1, 1798, and relating to talk of secession by Virginia and North Carolina. What Jefferson quotes Taylor as saying to him, in the letter to which this is a reply, is "that it is not *unusual* now to estimate the separate mass of Virginia and North Carolina, with a view to their separate existence." The reading "unwise", which appears in Randolph's and Washington's editions (III. 393. IV. 245), unfortunately appeared also in the text of Ford's (VII. 263). Mr. Ford caused a slip to be inserted at this page, to make the correction; but, unfortunately again, his printers corrected "unwise" into "usual", instead of into "unusual". That the latter is the proper reading was shown by George Tucker in the *Southern Literary Messenger*, for May, 1838 (IV. 344), and more recently by Mr. W. W. Henry in the *Virginia Magazine of History*, I. 325.

Lady Edgar's *General Brock*, in the "Makers of Canada" series, (Toronto, Morang and Co., pp. 322), is a plain tale of a popular hero. The manner of telling is for the most part barren and without distinction; only now and then does a gleam of enthusiasm light up the narrative; but the subject makes strong appeal to Canadian patriotism—to all, indeed, of whatever nation, who can recognize high worth in a man. Brock is a splendid figure of a soldier, and his exploits on the Canadian border during the War of 1812 shine all the more because in contrast with some of the least worthy of his foes.

The author has given her readers a good idea of Brock the man, and the soldier; she makes his deeds reveal character. This main line of the work is paralleled with a survey of the military and political conditions of his time. She gives us a gloss of many events in which Brock had no part; but holds well to the main purpose of showing what he had to do in the making of Canada.

Before he came to that country, in 1802, he had had seventeen years of military service under the British flag, in the West Indies, in Holland and Denmark. This long apprenticeship in Napoleonic strife had won him only the rank of colonel. Nine years of Canadian service, for the most part inactive and distasteful, brought him the appointment of administrator of the government of Upper Canada and the rank of major-general. The declaration of war by the United States in June, 1812, gave him the opportunity for which his talents fitted him and his soul longed. He organized raw material into an auxiliary force for defense, and at Detroit was quick to take advantage of Hull's timorous readiness to surrender. His commander-in-chief, Sir George Prevost, was cautious, fearful, hopeful for peace without bloodshed. Brock was foresighted, resourceful, audacious—and fortunate. And at Queenston, where the American attempt at assault was weakened by incompetence in the commander and undermined by insubordination and cowardice in the militia, Brock died the ideal death of a military hero, and gave to Canadian history its most glorious figure since the days of Wolfe.

That the author's pro-British point of view should influence her conclusions, is natural. She essays to justify the British policy of supplying arms and food to Indians who dwelt within the United States; and belittles the exploits of General Harrison in the Tippecanoe campaign of 1811. She has, properly enough, drawn on *The Life and Correspondence of Sir Isaac Brock*, which was edited many years since by his nephew, Ferdinand Brock Tupper; but we do not note any acknowledgment to this source, or any other, for her facts.

A few statements are singularly careless. The author has confused (p. 54) the storehouse which LaSalle built at Lewiston in 1678, with the fort which Denonville built at the mouth of the Niagara, seven miles below Lewiston, in 1687; nor did Denonville build, as the author states, of stone. "Fort Chippawa, on Lake Erie, a mile and a half above the falls of Niagara" (p. 58), and "eighteen miles up the lake was Fort Erie" (p. 59), are blunders which are made obvious by the map of the Niagara frontier later on in the volume. The statement (p. 284) that "General Van Rensselaer . . . relied in military matters on the advice of his cousin and adjutant, Col. Van Rensselaer," would be in a measure true, were the relationship correctly stated. Col. Solomon Van Rensselaer was a nephew of General Stephen Van Rensselaer, on whose staff he served at Queenston. The "Col. Clans" mentioned on p. 206, was no doubt of the famous Claus family; but no clue to this or many other names is afforded by the short and inadequate index.

Number eighteen of the Filson Club publications is devoted to *The Battle of the Thames, in which the Kentuckians defeated the British, French, and Indians, October 5, 1813*. The author, Colonel Bennett H. Young, deals with the decisive battle, which, following Perry's victory on Lake Erie, restored the supremacy of the United States in that portion of the Northwest which had passed under the control of the British by virtue of Hull's surrender of Detroit; and the recital calls

attention to the fact that the great Northwest, which was won for the nation by the valor and enterprise of Virginia, was restored to the Union by the descendants of those Virginians who originally achieved its conquest. It has been the pious purpose of the writer to put on record the names and exploits of the Kentuckians who so bravely retrieved the disasters which attended the first year of the War of 1812, and he has done this with a fullness that leaves nothing to be desired. The glow of state pride and satisfaction in the personal prowess of the leaders shines forth from every page; and if the muse of history shall seem for the time being to have parted from her usual reserve, all who delight in the sumptuous pages of the Filson Club publications will be willing to overlook the fact. It is to be noted, however, that notwithstanding the 274 broad pages of the monograph, the old conundrum of "Who killed Tecumseh?" still remains unanswered.

CHARLES MOORE.

Economic Essays, by Charles Franklin Dunbar. Edited by O. M. W. Sprague, with an Introduction by F. W. Taussig. (New York, Macmillan, 1904, pp. xvii, 372.) The late Professor Dunbar of Harvard University is remembered by students, friends, and readers as a teacher, counsellor, and writer of sanest judgment and lucid in exposition. For ten years, 1859 to 1869, he was editor of the *Boston Advertiser*, and not until 1876 did he begin to write at length over his own name. Even then he was sparing in his contributions. What he did write, however, was always welcomed and his modest volume on banking is generally regarded as a masterpiece. There was a widespread hope that Professor Dunbar would publish a more comprehensive treatise before his death, but excessive caution on his part, combined with failing health, doubtless explains his failure to meet this anticipation. It is a sad loss, rendered more keen in reading these scattered essays which together illustrate most forcibly the characteristic abilities of the author. There are twenty essays. Fourteen of these appeared in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*; one, a famous review of *Economic Science in America, 1776-1876*, in the *North American Review*; and five are chapters never before published. These latter are strictly historical, and treat of the crises of 1857 and 1860, state banks in 1860, and the establishment and circulation of national banks. Especially helpful are the chapters on the panic of 1857 and the description of the state banking systems in the middle of the century. Historians of economic conditions in the United States too frequently jump from the panic of 1837 to the Civil War period, as if the twenty years intervening required but little analysis. These studies of Professor Dunbar, though belated in publication, will do something to make good our deficiencies, and they also serve as admirable examples of interesting and intelligible generalizations based upon trade and banking statistics. Professor Dunbar attributes the crisis of 1857, not to extravagant importations, but to expansion in internal trade with a lengthening of credits, and to the imprudent management of this mass of credit by a poor banking system.

D. R. D.

A Monograph of the Origins of Settlement in the Province of New Brunswick. By William Ganong, Ph.D. (From the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, Vol. X., Sect. II. For sale by J. Hope and Sons, Ottawa, 1904, pp. 185.) This monograph by Prof. Ganong deserves much more than a passing notice owing to the richness of newly acquired data and the originality of its method. In the origin of settlements of any country the author discovers three determining factors. These are termed the historical, environmental and sociological. The historical factors are such as are connected with the discovery, conquest or peaceful expansion of a particular community. The environmental factors concern the physical nature, accessibility, lines of communication, natural wealth and climate of a country. The sociological factors are such as determine the manner in which a given people adapt themselves to a particular environment, and relate to government, occupation, racial peculiarities and religion. Too frequently history has been regarded as a narrative of interesting and important events. But the distinguishing feature of this work is the prominence which, in addition to the historical, is given throughout to the environmental and sociological factors. The operation of all three factors in the growth of New Brunswick settlements is here traced through every stage of its history from the earliest period to the present time. Much new and accurate information is to be found in almost every period. The cartography, too, is by the author himself and represents the location of the settlements in each era treated. A supplement contains an alphabetical list of New Brunswick settlements with a brief statement of their origin and the sources of information concerning them. A useful bibliography completes a monograph which can profitably be consulted by every student of New Brunswick history.

BENJAMIN RAND.

NOTES AND NEWS

GENERAL.

The Honorable John Hay, who died at his summer home on Lake Sunapee, New Hampshire, in July, was a life member of the American Historical Association. His career is too well known to need extensive notice in these columns; historically his chief work was his collaboration with John G. Nicolay in the preparation of their life of Lincoln. A large number of articles in periodicals have dealt with various phases of Mr. Hay's life and work, among which may be noted "John Hay in Literature" by W. D. Howells, in the *North American Review*, for September; "John Hay" by Shelby M. Cullom, *Independent*, July 13; "John Hay: An American Gentleman" by Walter Wellman, and "Mr. Hay's Work in Diplomacy" by John Bassett Moore, both in the August *Review of Reviews*.

Dr. Arthur L. Perry, professor emeritus of history and political economy in Williams College, died during the summer. He was better known as a writer on economic than on historical subjects. He published, in 1894, *Origins in Williamstown*, and in 1900, *Williamstown and Williams College*.

Friedrich Heinrich Suso Denifle, member of the Dominican order since 1861 and one of its greatest savants, died at Munich June 10, aged sixty-one. With Father Ehrle he founded in 1885 the *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, and in the same year published the first volume of *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400* (never finished). With M. Émile Chatelain he edited the *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*; in 1897-1899 he published *La Désolation des Églises, Monastères et Hôpitaux en France* (3v.). In his last years he wrote a strongly Roman Catholic biography of Luther and took a prominent part in Luther polemic.

Gymnasialoberlehrer Dr. Reinhold Rochricht died in Berlin in May, aged sixty-five. His important work was almost wholly on the Crusades, the eight main works published since 1874 comprising probably the most important contribution by any one scholar in this field. His latest publication was a supplement to his *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani* (1904), comprising an analysis of nine hundred documents.

Dr. Curt Wachsmuth, professor of ancient history and classical philology in the University of Leipzig, died at Leipzig June 8, aged sixty-eight. He is known chiefly by his *Die Stadt Athen im Altertum*.

Professor A. C. Coolidge of Harvard is on leave of absence for the current year and is travelling in Asia and Eastern Europe. During his

absence Professor A. L. P. Dennis of Wisconsin will deliver two courses during the first half-year: one on European history in the Napoleonic period, the other on the history of British India.

Dr. Arthur L. Frothingham, Jr., has resigned his professorship of ancient history and archaeology at Princeton University in order to devote himself to the work of original research.

We note a number of academic changes and appointments: Professor Allen Johnson of Iowa College is to be professor of history in Bowdoin College; Dr. William H. Allison has been elected professor of history in Franklin College, Indiana; Mr. Yates Snowden, formerly of the *Charleston News and Courier*, has been elected professor of history in South Carolina College; Dr. William K. Boyd has been appointed instructor at Dartmouth, in place of Dr. H. R. Shipman, who, together with Dr. Hiram Bingham, formerly of Harvard, has been appointed preceptor in Princeton; Dr. R. B. Merriman has been appointed permanent instructor in Harvard, and Mr. E. W. Pahlow, who has been an assistant at Harvard, goes to Wisconsin as instructor. Dr. O. P. Chitwood is to be professor of history in Mercer College, Georgia.

An international congress on facsimiles, or international congress for the reproduction of manuscripts, coins and seals, was held at Liège August 21-23, on the invitation of the Belgian minister of public instruction. Professor Kurth of Liège was chairman, Father van den Gheyn of the Bollandist Society secretary of the organizing committee. About eighty delegates were present, the United States being represented by Professor Charles M. Gayley of the University of California. M. Henri Omont, keeper of manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale, was chosen president. From such reports as have been received (see *New York Evening Post*, September 9) it appears that the papers which were read, and which will soon be accessible in print, were of great value to all who are interested in facsimile reproductions. Among the resolutions adopted was one favoring the formation in every country of a commission composed of specialists for the purpose of designating the manuscripts most desirable to be reproduced in facsimile; another requesting governments to draw up regulations permitting scholars to obtain, on the most liberal terms possible, the reproduction of manuscripts in which they are interested; and others looking toward the preparation of bibliographical lists of facsimiles already executed, and expressing opinions as to technical processes. A permanent international committee was formed, to prosecute the various interests represented. It consists of Messrs. Brambach of Carlsruhe, S. de Vries of Leyden, Ehrle of Rome, Gaillard of Brussels, Gayley of California, Karabacek of Vienna, Lange of Copenhagen, Nicholson of Oxford, Omont of Paris, Putnam of Washington, Salomon Reinach of Paris, Traub of Munich, and Van den Gheyn of Brussels. The committee has discretion to call another congress when and where it thinks best, and may possibly convene it in America. Professor Gayley's project for an

American Bureau of Reproduction and Library of Facsimiles, much discussed in the columns of the *Evening Post* last winter, was warmly commended, and there was much promise of co-operation on the part of the leading libraries of Europe.

The Macmillan Company announce for autumn publication a *General History*, described as philosophical in its character, by Dr. Emil Reich; a *History of Political Theories from Luther to Montesquieu*, by Professor William A. Dunning of Columbia University, continuing his previous volumes on the political theorists of ancient and medieval times; a *History of Education*, by Professor Paul Monroe of the same institution; the ninth volume ("Napoleon and his Times") of the *Cambridge Modern History*; and Vols. V.-VIII. of *Purchas*.

We are in receipt of a copy of the *First Annual Report* of the English Sociological Society, prefaced by an Address of the Hon. James Bryce, President, at the first annual general meeting, March 22. This society was constituted in November, 1903, with "scientific, educational, and practical aims", has a membership of four hundred, and seems well started on its career. Mr. Bryce's brief address is noteworthy for its moderation and practical spirit.

Vol. XXVI. of E. Berner's *Jahresbericht der Geschichtswissenschaft* has appeared, comprising the literature of 1903 (2v.).

The *Historisches Jahrbuch*, XXVI. 3, gives a detailed statement of the issues since 1903 in Lamprecht's *Allgemeine Staatengeschichte*, in the three divisions of "Geschichte der europ. Staaten", "Geschichte der aussereurop. Staaten", "Deutsche Landesgeschichte". It announces as in press the following: Bachmann, *Geschichte Böhmens*, Bd. II.; Jorga, *Geschichte Rumäniens*; Kretschmayer, *Geschichte Venedigs*; Seraphim, *Geschichte von Liv-, Est- und Kurland*, Bd. I.

An inexpensive *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte* has been published at Tübingen by K. Heussi and H. Mulert (66 maps,—M. 4).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Bernheim, *La Science Historique Moderne* (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, April). (This is apropos of Lamprecht's recent *Moderne Geschichtswissenschaft*, and aims to place Lamprecht with respect to methodology and to estimate his originality. Concludes that he is inconsistent, has derived his ideas mainly from Hegel and Comte, but has applied them with originality. In the June issue of the *Revue* Lamprecht makes a brief response); P. Lacombe, *Notes sur Taine* (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, April, June).

ANCIENT HISTORY.

The entire historical library of the late Theodor Mommsen has been presented to the University of Bonn. Professor Otto Hirschfeld, Mommsen's literary executor, is preparing for publication three volumes of his unpublished writings. The first volume, which has already appeared, contains sixteen essays on Egyptian and Roman law. The other

two will contain contributions to the history of Roman law, law-books and legal procedure.

The Macmillan Company have issued the first number of "University of Michigan Studies", edited by H. A. Sanders and devoted to Roman history.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Savio, *Alcune Considerazioni sulla prima Diffusione del Cristianesimo* (Rivista di Scienze Storiche, I. Contends that Christian proselytism proceeded in the West much more slowly than usually supposed); A. Muller, *Sterbekassen und Vereine mit Begräbnisfürsorge in der Römischen Kaiserzeit* (Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, March); J. Reville, *Le Progrès de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique Ancienne au XIX siècle et son Etat actuel* (Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, L. 3).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

A renewed historical interest and activity is being manifested at present in the Benedictine Order. In 1906 there will begin in Rome the publication of a quarterly *Rivista Storica Benedettina*, directed by members of the order and devoted to its history especially in Italy. French Benedictines are projecting a resumption of the labors of the Benedictines of Saint-Maur in the field of the history of the religious orders, and plan a series entitled, *La France Monastique*; while in May appeared the first issue of the *Revue Mabillon*, the chief contributors being J. M. Besse, L. Levilain, and G. Guillot.

German Roman Catholic scholars have begun the publication of a series of Lives of the Saints (*Sammlung Illustrierter Heiligenleben*,—Kempten and Munich, Kosel), intended to bring before the public the result of the latest investigations. There have already been published (1904): Gunter, *Kaiser Heinrich II. der Heilige*; Egger, *Der heilige Augustinus, Bischof von Hippo*; and Kralik, *Der Hl. Leopold, Markgraf von Oesterreich*. The series is intended to be analogous to the French one of M. Joly, *Les Saints*; in this latter the latest publications (Paris, Lecoffre) are the Abbé Martin's *Saint Columban*, and Suan's *Saint François de Borgia* (1905).

An important addition has just been made to Professor Ulrich Stutz's (Bonn) "Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen" by L. K. Goetz, *Kirchenrechtliche und Kulturgeschichtliche Denkmäler Altrusslands, nebst Geschichte des Russischen Kirchenrechts* (Stuttgart, 1905). The documents are presented in German translations, though for some the original Russian is also given.

The Arna-Magnaean Legation have brought out the second and concluding part of their palaeographical atlas. The first or Danish section appeared in 1903. The present volume presents thirty-seven folio phototype plates, containing facsimile reproductions of fifty-three Norse or Icelandic manuscripts or documents of the period 1150-1300—Grágás, Heimskringla, the Codex Regius of the Edda of Saemund, etc. The

Carlsberg Fund has promised to defray the expenses of an additional Norwegian-Icelandic section, continuing the work into the fifteenth century.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Seeliger, *Forschungen zur Geschichte der Grundherrschaft im früheren Mittelalter* (Hist. Vierteljahrsschrift, Aug. A useful survey of the successive views).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

Dr. Ludwig Pastor has undertaken to publish a collection of documents on papal history from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century (*Ungedruckte Akten zur Geschichte der Päpste vornehmlich im XVI.-XVII. Jahrhundert*) as supplement to his history of the Popes. Vol. I. comprises 205 documents and comes to 1464.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Richard, *Origines de la Nonciature de France: Nonces Résidents avant Léon X., 1456-1511* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); S. Ehses, *Hat Paolo Sarpi für seine Geschichte des Konzils von Trient aus Quellen geschöpft, die jetzt nicht mehr fliessen?* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXVI. 2); J. F. Jameson, *The Age of Erudition* (University of Chicago Record, July).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Longmans, Green and Co. announce an important co-operative *Political History of England*, under the general editorship of Rev. William Hunt, now President of the Royal Historical Society. It will comprise twelve octavo volumes (450-500 pp.) and will be intended for the public, though furnished with critical and bibliographical appendices to each volume. The authors are announced as follows: Vol. I. 1066, Thomas Hodgkin; II. 1066-1216, Professor George B. Adams; III. 1216-1377, T. F. Tout; IV. 1377-1485, C. Oman; V. 1485-1547, H. A. L. Fisher; VI. 1547-1603, A. F. Pollard; VII. 1603-1660, F. C. Montague; VIII. 1660-1702, R. Lodge; IX. 1702-1760, I. S. Leadam; X. 1760-1801, Rev. W. Hunt; XI. 1801-1837, Hon. G. C. Brodrick and J. K. Fotheringham; XII. 1837-1901, Sidney J. Low. Some of these volumes will appear the present year.

The Clarendon Press published in July an *Illustrated Catalogue of a Loan Collection of Portraits of English Historical personages who died between 1625 and 1714* recently exhibited at Oxford. The volume is of much interest and contains descriptions of 228 portraits (representing 42 painters, the chief of whom are Kneller and Lely) with brief biographical notes on the subjects; 66 of these are excellently reproduced. A brief introduction by Mr. Lionel Cust, Director of the National Portrait Gallery, sketches the development of portrait painting that came in the later seventeenth century through the influence of Van Dyck. The artistic interest of the volume is perhaps not very great, but the student of the period will find it of much service. The originals were contributed to the Loan Exhibition mainly by the different Oxford

colleges, though the largest single contribution was that of the Bodleian Library.

The first three volumes of the official series of Indian Records published by the government of India, *Bengal in 1756-57*, with an historical introduction by the editor, Mr. S. C. Hill, will shortly appear (London, Murray).

It was announced that the literary executors of Cardinal Newman have entrusted the writing of his biography to Mr. Wilfrid Ward. The life of Cardinal Manning has been undertaken by the Rev. W. H. Kent, who is in possession of much new material.

Mr. John Murray will shortly publish *Further Memoirs of the Whig Party, 1807-1821*, by the third Lord Holland, edited by Lord Stavordale; a *Life of Sir James Graham*, edited by Mr. C. S. Parker; and *The Military Life of H. R. H. the Duke of Cambridge*, written under the authority of the late duke from documents in his own possession. But the *Letters of Queen Victoria*, edited by Mr. A. C. Benson and Viscount Esher, though progressing rapidly, cannot, it is announced, be ready for some months.

An organization called "The Cantilupe Society" has been instituted, for the publication of episcopal registers and other ecclesiastical documents of the diocese of Hereford. The secretary is the Rev. J. R. Burton of Ludlow.

In connection with Macmillan's recent announcement of *The Life of St. Patrick and his Place in History*, by Professor J. B. Bury, it should be noticed that N. J. D. White, D.D., has published in Vol. XXV. of the *Proceedings* of the Royal Irish Academy (Dublin, 1905), a new critical edition of "Libri Sancti Patricii, The Latin Writings of St. Patrick", with introduction and English translations.

The scanty material on Irish history of the middle of the eighteenth century is now being added to by the publication in the *English Historical Review* of the correspondence of Archbishop Stone and the Duke of Newcastle, edited by C. Litton Falkiner from the Newcastle Papers in the British Museum. The first installment (July) is confined to the year 1753 and throws light upon an important and obscure controversy on finances in the Irish Parliament in that year; a matter which is represented as important in the development of the modern Irish Party. In this connection there is an interesting article in the July *Edinburgh Review*, "Ireland under George II.", based on the "Report on the MSS. of Mrs. Stopford-Sackville of Drayton House, Northamptonshire", I., 1904.

Vol. IX. of the second series of *Archaeologia* contains interesting accounts of the recent excavations of Caergwent (Venta Silurum), of additional portions of the Roman wall of London found at Newgate, of the hauberk of chain mail and its conventional representations, and of the Crystal of Lothair; also, some chancery proceedings of the fifteenth century and records of the manor of Durrington.

The latest volume of the Oxford Historical Society is an excellent numismatical treatise, well illustrated by facsimiles, *Oxford Silver Pennies from A. D. 925 to A. D. 1272*, by Mr. C. L. Stainer.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. T. Waugh, *Sir John Oldcastle*, I. (*English Historical Review*, July).

FRANCE.

The French government is projecting a reorganization of French archival deposits, attention having been called to defects by historical societies and legislative discussion. A commission of investigation has been established under the presidency of the Minister of Public Instruction. The main change projected is the nationalization of the administration of the archives, the departmental archives being now locally controlled and without close relations with the central ones. This movement toward centralization is however opposed by the consistent advocates of provincial autonomy.

M. Aulard has begun a new and revised edition of his *Orateurs de la Révolution*, the first volume, "L'Assemblée Constituante", having appeared (Paris, 1905, pp. 573).

Students of revolutionary history will welcome any additions to the publications of municipal *Procès-verbaux*. Those of the city of Lyons that were issued last year will be usefully supplemented by those of a neighboring town, Villefranche-sur-Saône, which reflects the development in its great neighbor. This is being published now in the *Journal de Villefranche*, edited by Dr. A. Besançon; the first volume covers 1789-1793.

The Société d'Histoire Contemporaine has undertaken the publication of the *Correspondance* of La Forêt, French ambassador in Spain 1808-1813. There are 835 dispatches, which will be published during the next six years in six volumes.

The Société des Archives Historiques de la Gironde issues as its volume for 1904 a reproduction of fifty seventeenth-century drawings of the towns and monuments of southwest France. These were the work of two Dutch artists, Hermann van der Hem and Joachim de Weert.

The Société Archéologique et Historique de la Charente has published *Tables Générales* of its *Bulletins et Mémoires*, 1845-1900, prepared by J. Baillet and J. de la Martinière (Angoulême, 1905, pp. 365).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Lucien Febvre, *La Franche-Comté* (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, April and June); V. L. Bourilly, *Les Rapports de François I. et d'Henri II. avec les Ducs de Savoie, Charles II. et Emmanuel Philibert, 1515-1550, d'après des Travaux Récents* (*Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, June); E. Bourgeois, *La Collaboration de Saint-Simon et de Torcy; Étude Critique sur les Mémoires de St.-Simon* (*Revue Historique*, July-August); W. Struck, *Die Notabelnversammlung von 1787* (*Historische Vierteljahrschrift*,

August); P. Boissonade, *Les Études relatives à l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution Française, 1789-1804* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, April and June); A. Mathiez, *La Question Sociale pendant la Révolution Française* (La Révolution Française, May 14); E. Daudet, *L'Église et le Roi pendant l'Émigration, d'après des Documents Inédits* (Le Correspondant, May 10); P. Caron, *Les Comités Militaires des Assemblées de la Révolution, 1789—an VIII*. (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, July); H. Poulet, *Le Département de la Meuse à la fin du Directoire et au début du Consulat* (La Révolution Française, XXIV, 7, 8).

ITALY.

For the benefit of students at a distance, who may desire palaeographical or historical information from Italian libraries or archives, there has been established at Florence (Via delle Lane, 7), under the charge of Professor I. M. Palmarini, an Istituto delle Carte, which engages to make such researches at a modest rate of compensation. There will be corresponding secretaries in other Italian towns. The telegraphic address is "Isticarte, Firenze."

The labors of foreigners in Italian archives will still further be facilitated by the recent establishment in Rome of what is called an "Uffizio Bibliografico," intended to undertake researches and to supply copies of documents or bibliographical information. Not long since Professor Benigni established such a bureau in Rome (Via della Stettetta, 7), and Professor Enrico Celani has now opened another (Via Vittoria Colonna, 18). Both of these undertake archival work in any part of Italy.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Solini, *La Funzione Pratica della Storia del Diritto Italiano nelle Scienze Giuridiche* (Rivista Italiana per le Scienze Giuridiche, XXXV.); E. Romano, *La Guerra fra i Visconti e la Chiesa, 1360-1376* (Bollettino del Società Pavese di Storia Patria, III).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA.

At the office of the Prussian Gesamtkatalog in Berlin a general information bureau for German libraries has been recently established. It is designed to furnish information as to whether any desired and specified book is in any of the associated German libraries, and, if so, just where it may be found. The charge for each book sought is ten pfennigs.

Dr. Reinhold Koser of the Prussian Archives has been placed at the head of the Direction of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, with the work remaining mainly in the hands of Professor O. Holder-Egger.

The *Historisches Jahrbuch*, XXVI, 3, pp. 698-704, gives a detailed statement concerning the publications of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, as given out June 8, and (p. 704) a similar statement of the publications of the Historical Commission for Hesse and Waldeck. In

XXVI. 1, of the same journal, will be found detailed information of the state of the publications and undertakings of the Roman Institute of the Görres-Gesellschaft, of the Historical Commission of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences, of the Historical Commission of Baden, and of the Commission for the Modern History of Austria. It should be remarked that the publication of the German *Städtechroniken* has been placed upon a new footing by the appointment of Professor Georg von Below as director in succession to the late Karl von Hegel, and by specific resolutions as to immediate publication and the scope of the entire undertaking.

Recent issues of German provincial collections are as follows: *Regesten der Markgrafen von Baden und Hochberg*, III. 3-4 (1431-1453); *Inventäre des grossherzoglichen Badischen General-landarchivs*, II. 1; *Monumenta Historica Ducatus Carinthiae*, III. (A. D. 800-1202); *Codex Diplomaticus Lusatiae Superioris*, II. (1434-1437); *Mecklenburgisches Urkundenbuch*, XXI. (1386-1390); *Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolaris Moraviae*, XIV., XV. (1408-1411); *Urkunden und Regesten zur Geschichte der Rheinlande aus dem Vatikanischen Archiv*, II. (1327-1341); *Urkunden zur Pfälzischen Kirchengeschichte im Mittelalter* (XIII.-XVI. cent.); *Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae*, XXII. (1327-1333); *Urkundenbuch des Herzogthums Steiermark*, III. (1246-1260); *Regesta Diplomatica necnon Epistolaria Historiae Thuringiae*, III. (1228-1247); *Westfälisches Urkundenbuch*, VIII. (1277-1284); *Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte Niedersachsens*, X. *Urkundenbuch des Stiftes und Stadt Hameln*, II. (XV.-XVI. cent.); XI. *Urkundenbuch des Hochstifts Hildesheim und seiner Bischöfe*, III. (1260-1310); *Thüringische Geschichtsquellen*, VI. *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Jena und ihrer geistlichen Anstalten*, II. (1406-1525); *Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen*, XXXIII. *Urkundenbuch des Klosters Pforte*, I. (1300-1350); *Quellenbuch der Gesellschaft für Schleswig-Holsteinische Geschichte*, VI. *Quellen zur Geschichte des Bistums Schleswig*; *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, II. (1458-1493).

B. Krusch has edited for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Handausgabe*, Jonas's "Vitae Sanctorum Columbani, Vedastis, Johannis" (Hannover and Leipzig, 1905, pp. xii, 366). He had already edited these for Volumes II. and IV. of the *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum*; here however they are not merely brought together in a more convenient form, but Krusch has also used for the Life of Columban almost three times as many manuscripts (c. 115) as in the preceding edition and has added many new readings. He has also taken the opportunity to retract his former statements as to the place of the baptism of Clovis. The other changes are of less importance.

The German Government has presented to the Harvard College Library a complete set of the *Stenographische Berichte* of the German Reichstag, beginning in 1867 with the Reichstag of the North German Confederation. The set comprises 255 volumes and new volumes will

be added as they are published. The gift is intended to form a part of the Hohenzollern Collection of works in German history established in 1903 by Professor A. C. Coolidge, who purchased the library of Professor Konrad von Maurer for that purpose. The curator of the collection, Mr. Walter Lichtenstein, has been in Europe during the past summer searching for valuable additions to it.

Mr. John Murray of London publishes *The Hatzfeldt Letters*, translated from the French,—entertaining and on the whole important letters which Count Paul Hatzfeldt, who was afterward (1885-1901) German ambassador in London, wrote to his wife from the headquarters of the king of Prussia in 1870-1871.

The *Hansisches Urkundenbuch* (Leipzig, Duncker and Humblot) covers with the ninth volume (1903, pp. 751) the period 1463-1470.

The *Historische Vierteljahrsschrift* for June ("Nachrichten und Notizen II.") gives a useful summary of the publications during the last decade of the Gesellschaft für Sächsische Kirchengeschichte (*Beiträge zur Sächsischen Kirchengeschichte*).

In May there was founded at Bamberg a "Gesellschaft für Fränkische Geschichte", which proposes to publish studies in many fields of west-German history under the title of *Veröffentlichungen*. It is in receipt of government aid. In January there was established an "Oberschlesischer Geschichtsverein", publishing a journal, the *Oberschlesische Heimat*.

The very important undertaking by the Austrian Historical Institute of the publication of the *Regesta Habsburgica: Regesten der Gräfen von Habsburg und der Herzöge von Oesterreich aus dem Hause Habsburg* has been begun by the publication of H. Steinacker's *Die Regesten der Gräfen von Habsburg bis 1281* (Innsbruck, 1905). The preparation of these *Regesten* was undertaken as early as 1833 by E. Birk, and Steinacker has been working ten years on this volume, the documents being scattered and there being many critical problems. He goes back beyond the acquisition of the imperial dignity in 1275, five hundred documents appearing for the period 950-1274. It is intended to bring this series down to 1493. Vol. II., 1281-1330, being in preparation by M. Steinacker, and the third volume, 1331-1365, being entrusted to Dr. Kretschmayr.

The Vienna Academy of Sciences has begun the publication of "Oesterreichische Urbare" in the four divisions of *Urbare* of Landesfürsten, Hochstifter, ecclesiastical and lay Grundherrschaften. Vol. I. (1904), edited by Dopsch and Levec, deals with Upper and Lower Austria in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

The "Commission for the Modern History of Austria" is about to publish Dr. A. Kretschmayr's completion of Dr. Fellner's *Geschichte der Organisation der oesterreichischen Zentralverwaltung*. In the series of *Staatsverträge*, A. F. Pribram is working on the relations with England, H. Schlitter on those with France, R. V. Srbik on the Netherlands,

R. Gross on Bavaria. There is announced for near publication the correspondence of Charles V. with Margaret of Austria and Mary of Hungary, 1522-1530.

A new series of monographs in Austrian history is begun at Innsbruck under the direction of A. Dopsch: "Forschungen zur inneren Geschichte Oesterreichs". The first volume (1904) is H. Srbik's *Die Beziehungen von Staat und Kirche in Oesterreich während des Mittelalters*.

In the *Mittheilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtskunde*, XXVI. 157-159, G. Steinherz gives a full analysis of the publications of the "Historische Landeskommision für Steiermark", Hefte 1-19, Graz, 1896-1903. This Commission was founded 1892 and its judicious publications are now of great value, such names as Krones and Loserth showing the character of the leadership of the society, of which Professor v. Zwiedineck-Südenhorst is secretary.

Messrs. Weiss and Friss have just published at Budapest (1904, pp. xli, 524) the first volume of a collection of documents entitled *Monumenta Hungariae Judaica*, covering the period 1092-1539.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Brandi, *Passauer Vertrag und Augsburger Religionsfriede* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, XCV. 2); R. Hoeniger, *Die Kontinentalsperre und ihre Einwirkungen auf Deutschland* (*Volkswirtschaftliche Zeitfragen*, 211); *Aus dem Frankfurter Parlament: Briefe des Abgeordneten Ernst von Sancken-Tarpitschen*, edited by G. von Below (*Deutsche Rundschau*, July); A. Wahl, *Die Unterredung Bismarcks mit dem Herzog Friedrich von Augustenburg am 1. Juni 1864* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, XCV. 1); H. Plehn, *Zur Geschichte der Agrarverfassung von Ost- und Westpreussen* (*Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preussischen Geschichte*, XVII.); W. Meiners, *Landschulwesen und Landschullehrer im Herzogtum Cleve vor Hundert Jahren* (*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, III. 3).

NETHERLANDS.

The "Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde" has published the first part of a *Repertorium der Verhandelingen en Bijdragen betreffende de Geschiedenis des Vaderlands* (Leyden), prepared by L. D. Petit, of the library of the University of Leyden. There will be several parts, and the work will include titles of review articles as well as books, coming to 1900.

The first volumes have appeared of the "Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica", edited by Dr. S. Cramer and Dr. F. Pijper, under the auspices of several learned societies. The series aims to reprint rare Dutch publications of the Reformation era, and Vol. I., *Polemische Geschriften der Hervormingsgezinden*, comprises eleven papers, while Vol. II., *Het Offer des Heeren*, is a book of martyrs and a collection of early religious songs.

The Dutch Royal Historical Commission has begun at the expense of the state the publication of documents pertaining to the revolutionary and nineteenth-century history of Holland, under the title, *Gedenkstukken der Algemeene Geschiedenis van Nederland van 1795 tot 1840*, and has published the first volume, edited by Dr. H. T. Colenbrander and dealing with 1789-1795 (Hague, pp. lxxviii, 720). The editor supplies an introduction on the relations between the Revolution and the Netherlands; this is followed by 525 documents, mainly from the correspondence of prominent public men, arranged chronologically in groups with explanatory notes. We have here evidently a very important addition to our printed sources.

The Utrecht Historical Society expects before many months to publish in its *Bijdragen* a supplement to the well-known and valued *Diaries and Correspondence of Lord Auckland*, consisting of a large number of dispatches hitherto unpublished, edited by M. Henry de Peyster.

AMERICA.

GENERAL ITEMS.

In the list of publications to be issued this fall by Houghton, Mifflin and Company occur notices of several historical and biographical volumes: *James G. Blaine*, by Edward Stanwood; *James Russell Lowell*, by Ferris Greenslet; *The England and Holland of the Puritans*, by Morton Dexter; *The Development of Religious Liberty in Connecticut*, by M. Louise Greene; *Mount Desert: A History*, by George E. Street; *A History of the Town of Middleboro, Mass.*, by Thomas Weston; *A Sketch of Etna and Kirkersville, Licking Co., Ohio*, by General Morris Schaff. Three additions to the American Commonwealths Series are promised: *Louisiana*, by Albert Phelps; *Rhode Island*, by Irving B. Richman; and a new edition of Judge Cooley's *Michigan*.

Among the fall announcements of the Macmillan Company should be noted a *Life of Oliver Ellsworth*, by William Garrott Brown; *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*, by Walter L. Fleming; *The Industrial History of the United States*, by Katharine Coman; and Professor Smyth's ten-volume edition of *The Life and Writings of Franklin*.

Among other fall announcements not elsewhere noted we mention the following: By Little, Brown, and Company: *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, by Captain Alfred T. Mahan; *The True Story of Paul Revere*, by Charles Getterny. By the Putnams: *The Abolitionists*, by John F. Hume. By the Century Company: *Captain Myles Standish*, by Tudor Jenks.

Mr. Thomas Forsythe Nelson announces that he is about to commence the publication of *Americana Historica*, a quarterly magazine devoted to "American historical, biographical, and genealogical research." Mr. Nelson's reputation as a genealogist should insure a high grade of excellence for his magazine. It will be published in Washington.

A number of auction sales of historical interest are announced for the fall and winter. Among the most important is that of Governor Pennypacker's library which contains a large number of Franklin documents and imprints, many early Pennsylvania imprints, and an autograph diary kept by George Washington. The collection of Washington portraits owned by James T. Mitchell, chief-justice of Pennsylvania, is also to be disposed of, as well as the remainder of the Carson collection of prints, which includes pictures of American land and naval battles, political cartoons, and portraits of Revolutionary characters. The sales will be under the charge of Mr. Stan. V. Henkels.

The first volume of Mr. Charles Evans's *American Bibliography* was noted in these pages some months ago. It will be remembered that Mr. Evans's purpose was to prepare a complete bibliography of books, pamphlets, and periodicals printed in the United States from 1639 to 1820. The first volume, which contained 3,244 titles, brought the list (arranged in chronological order) to 1729; the second volume, dated 1904, completes the list through 1750 and brings the entries to number 6,623. A third volume will be issued in the fall, and the remaining five or six will appear at intervals.

William C. Doub's *History of the United States* (Macmillan, pp. 669) is a text-book distinguished by the author's effort to combine history and civics, thus making unnecessary the use of separate books. The method is topical.

In the *July Magazine of History* we note the concluding paper, by Warren Upham, on "The Progress of Discovery of the Mississippi River," dealing with Groseilliers, Radisson, Joliet, Marquette, DuLuth, Hennepin and Le Sueur, and a paper on "Educational and Literary Activity in Alabama", by Walter L. Fleming. In Livingston R. Schuyler's history of the Liberty of the Press, Chapter III. deals with the development in Pennsylvania. In this number is commenced the journal contributed by Mr. C. S. Brigham, kept by Eliza Williams Bridgman, of "A Journey through New England and New York in 1818." We note a letter, not given in full, from George Washington to General George Clinton, New York, July 26, 1776.

ITEMS CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED.

The latest volume to appear in the "Trail-Makers Series" (A. S. Barnes) is one of the most noteworthy. *The Journey of Alcar Nunez Cabeza de Vaca and his Companions from Florida to the Pacific, 1528-1536*. The translation has been ably made from the first edition, Zamora, 1542, by Mrs. Fanny Bandelier, whose husband, Mr. Adolph F. Bandelier, has edited the volume. The next book to appear in the series will be *The Journeys of La Salle and His Companions, 1668-1687, as Related by Himself and His Followers*, in two volumes, edited by Dr. I. J. Cox.

Two volumes of revolutionary material are promised for the fall by Dodd, Mead and Company. One will contain a reprint of the "Minutes of the Committee of Safety of the County of Tryon (N. Y.) from the First Meeting in the Palatine District, Aug. 27, 1774, to Nov. 24, 1775." The other will be *A History of the Declaration of Independence*, by J. H. Hazelton.

The Sharon (Mass.) Historical Society has reprinted a rare pamphlet: *An Address Delivered in 1802 in Various Towns in Massachusetts, Rhode Island and New York, by Mrs. Deborah Sampson Gannett*. Deborah Sampson, under the name of Robert Shurtleff, enlisted in the Continental army, and was honorably discharged in 1783. The address tells of her revolutionary experiences.

Under the heading "American Revolutionary Naval Service" the *New Hampshire Genealogical Record* for April contains an account of the continental frigate *Raleigh*.

The discovery of the body of John Paul Jones has called forth a considerable amount of material concerning the hero. *Old South Leaflet*, No. 152, is made up of Jones's account of the battle with the *Scrapis*, and of his letter to Congress in 1775 on the development of a navy. Historical notes including a biographical sketch are appended. The question as to whether Jones's body has really been found is discussed in the *Independent* for July 13 and 20: "The Identification of John Paul Jones's Body," by Louis Capitan; "Is it Paul Jones's Body?" by Park Benjamin. The September *Century* contains "A Rare Portrait of Paul Jones," together with other more common portraits, and text by Alexander Corbett, Jr. The July *Scribner's* contains the "Narrative of John Kilby," who was quarter-gunner on the *Bon-Homme Richard*, while in the *Review of Reviews* for July is a noteworthy article by Dr. C. H. Lincoln of the Library of Congress on "John Paul Jones and our First Triumphs on the Sea."

C. S. Hall has edited the *Life and Letters of Samuel Holden Parsons* (Binghamton, N. Y., Osteningo Publishing Company, pp. 601). Parsons was a major-general in the Continental army, and chief judge of the Northwest Territory from 1787 to 1789.

The Century Company's new "Thumbnail" books will include a volume on George Washington. In it will be printed many of Washington's writings, including his principal state papers, his farewell and inaugural addresses, and his circular disbanding the armies of the United States. The passage on "The Character of Washington" in Lecky's *England in the Eighteenth Century* will serve as introduction.

Washington in Germantown, by C. Francis Jenkins (Philadelphia, W. J. Campbell) is an account of Washington's visits to Germantown as commander-in-chief and president.*

The Century Company announces *Washington and the West*, a volume which will contain the diary kept by Washington in September, 1784, during his journey in the Ohio basin in the interests of commer-

cial communication between the lakes and the Potomac. The diary will be edited by A. B. Hulbert.

Mr. W. F. Reddaway's prize essay on the *Monroe Doctrine* (1896), having become distinctly scarce, has been reprinted by Messrs. G. E. Stechert and Company of New York, after some modifications by the author.

The Paris house of Plon-Nourrit has recently published a volume on the United States by M. de Barral-Montferrat: *De Monroe à Roosevelt, 1823-1905*, with a preface by M. le Comte d'Haussonville.

Amusing and by no means uninteresting is Frank Weitenkamp's "Social History of the United States in Caricature," which commenced in the *August Critic*. The many cartoons reproduced constitute a running commentary on various phases of social life in America, and as illustrative material are distinctly valuable.

A complete edition of the *Writings of Abraham Lincoln* is announced by the Putnams. The work will be edited by Arthur Brooks Lapsley and will include, besides the writings, the full text of the Lincoln-Douglas debates, Carl Schurz's essay on Lincoln, Joseph Choate's address, and the life of Lincoln by Noah Brooks.

At the annual session of the Société d'Histoire Diplomatique, held in Paris on June 9, an address was delivered by Lewis Einstein, third secretary of the American Embassy in London, on "Napoléon III. et les Préliminaires Diplomatiques de la Guerre Civile aux États-Unis." The address is printed in the July number of the *Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*.

The fourth volume of the *Papers* of the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts is devoted to the Wilderness campaign of May-June, 1864.

A volume of military reminiscences is Edwin H. Tremain's *Two Days of War: A Gettysburg Narrative, and Other Excursions* (New York: Bonnell, Silver and Bowers). The contents include recollections of the battle of Gettysburg, Sherman's march to the sea, the battle of Chancellorsville, Reconstruction incidents, and other material.

The Putnams have brought out a second edition of Lieutenant Elliott's *Life of John Ancrum Winslow, Rear Admiral United States Navy*.

Much light has been thrown on the inner life of the Confederacy by recent semi-biographical books dealing with the experiences of prominent women. Two such volumes have appeared within the last six months: *A Diary from Dixie*, as written by Mrs. Mary B. Chesnut, edited by Isabella D. Martin and Myrta L. Avery (Appleton) and, more recent, Mrs. Louise Wigfall Wright's *A Southern Girl in '61* (Doubleday, Page and Company).

The *American Catholic Historical Researches* for July contains articles on the reputed membership of Abraham Lincoln in the Catholic church, and on the respective claims for John Barry and John Paul

Jones, relative to the founding of the American Navy. Of more historical value are the despatches from Bishop Lynch, commissioner of the Confederate States to the Holy See, to Judah P. Benjamin. These documents are among the so-called "Pickett papers" in the archives of the Treasury Department.

Professor Walter L. Fleming has published a compilation of the so-called "Black laws" passed by the Southern states in 1865-1866 for the regulation of the freedmen. It appears as one of the *West Virginia Documents relating to Reconstruction*. The same writer has prepared a syllabus on "The Reconstruction of Seceded States, 1865-76," which is published by the New York State Education Department as Syllabus 97; July, 1905. This outline, in eleven chapters, deals with the various stages and phases of Reconstruction and contains full references for reading. Appended is a large amount of illustrative material chosen with considerable care and covering a large field.

We have received from the compiler (who apparently is also the publisher) a volume entitled *America's Aid to Germany in 1871-72, An Abstract from the Official Correspondence of E. B. Washburne, U. S. Ambassador to Paris; The English text, with a German translation*, by Adolf Hepner (St. Louis, 1905, pp. 463). Mr. Hepner's preface says that "This publication principally aims to acquaint Germans with the services rendered them by the United States in times of great distress and danger"; while it may be of some service in this direction, the book is entirely valueless to the historical student. The official correspondence of Mr. Washburne, which was published by order of Congress in 1878 under the title *Franco-German War*, embraces 232 letters, of which this compilation abstracts parts of 158; there are no notes, the compiler apparently paying no attention even to Mr. Washburne's *Recollections* or private correspondence.

A volume dealing with recent history is *Essais d'Histoire Diplomatique Américaine*, by M. Achille Viallate (Paris, Guilmoto). The Spanish war, the expansion of the United States and the Panama canal are the subjects dealt with.

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER.

It is now announced, simultaneously with the publication of the first part, that the Index to Persons in the first fifty volumes of the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* will consist of eighteen parts, six of which will be issued each year.

Compulsory Education in New England, 1850-1890, an historical summary, by Professor John William Perrin of Cleveland, has been reprinted from the *Journal of Pedagogy* for June.

A History of Boothbay, Southport, and Boothbay Harbor, Maine, 1623-1905, by Francis B. Greene, is promised for the early part of next year. Nearly one-half of the 700 pages will be devoted to family genealogies.

The Vermont Sons of the American Revolution celebrated the 128th anniversary of the Battle of Bennington on August 16, by the dedication of a memorial tower to Ethan Allen. The tower was erected in Burlington on the Ethan Allen farm.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has chartered an association bearing the name of the "Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay," and consisting of male descendants of the freemen of the original Massachusetts Bay Company. The society is instituted for the purpose of historical and genealogical research, especially with relation to the history of the company chartered by Charles I. The executive officers are George E. Littlefield, governor; Walter K. Watkins, recorder; and Eben Putnam, secretary. On June 17 a meeting was held at Cambridge, Massachusetts, for the purpose of organizing an Historical Society. Richard Dana was elected president, and Frank Gaylord Cook secretary.

The tract, bearing the title *The Humble Request of the Governour and the Company late gone to New England to the Rest of their Brethren of the Church of England*, London, 1630, signed by Winthrop and other colonists before leaving England, has been reprinted in facsimile by Lowdermilk and Company of Washington. The edition is limited to one hundred copies; an introduction has been supplied by Professor J. L. Ewell, and a bibliographical note by Mr. Wilberforce Eames.

One of the most notable of recent contributions to early Massachusetts history is *Early Census Making in Massachusetts* by Josiah H. Benton, Jr. The *raison d'être* of this book was the finding of what Mr. Benton believes to be an original compilation from the returns of the enumeration of 1765. This document, which is designated as the Crane Manuscript, shows the total white population of the province to have been 238,226, whereas the generally accepted figure, computed from a manuscript, lost since 1822 but printed in the *Columbian Centinel* of Boston for August 22, 1822, has been 240,220. The Crane Manuscript is printed in facsimile and other documentary material of considerable value is also included: a compilation from the census of negro slaves in 1754-5; Governor Belcher's reply to the queries of the Lords of Trade respecting the state of the province, April 5, 1751; and similar replies from Governor Bernard of April 29 and September 5, 1763. These letters found in the Public Record Office are of great value. The Crane Manuscript has been presented by Mr. Benton to the Boston Public Library.

Mr. Benjamin T. Hill is editing for the American Antiquarian Society the diary of Isaiah Thomas, the society's first president. The diary covers the years from 1805 to 1828, and is said to be of value historically.

Much information on the military events of the last years of the Revolution is to be found in the Seventh Series, Volume V., of the Massachusetts Historical Society's *Collections*. This volume constitutes Part III. of the "Heath Papers," and deals with General William

Heath's military career from January, 1780, to the summer of 1783. A few later letters are added and the appendix has extracts from Heath's *Orderly Book* giving the history of the court-martial for the trial of General McDougall.

The Registry Department of the City of Boston has issued the thirty-third volume in the series formerly called the *Reports of the Record Commissioners*. It contains minutes of the selectmen's meetings from 1799 to 1810, inclusive. The registrar has also issued, as an accompaniment to this series, a series of four carefully executed plans of Boston, prepared from early records, and showing, for 1630, 1635, 1640 and 1645, the ways or streets and the owners of property.

Two biographical sketches of Rev. William Bentley and a bibliography of his literary labors, which appear in *The Historical Collections of the Essex Institute* for July, prepare the way for the forthcoming publication of the diary of this teacher and preacher. The diary covers the period from 1781 to 1819. The Institute also announces the early appearance of an index to forty volumes of its *Historical Collections*.

An interesting contribution to local history is Miss Mary F. Ayer's article on "The South Meeting House, Boston (1669-1729)" in the July number of *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register*. Of particular note are the illustrations accompanying the sketch.

An interesting and unusual feature of the third number of the *Publications of the Weymouth Historical Society* is a reprint of an address delivered by Mr. Charles Francis Adams in 1874 at the 250th anniversary of the Massachusetts town of Weymouth, accompanied by a paper written thirty years later by Mr. Adams on the history of the same place; where the author reviews his own previous work and arrives at more mature conclusions. Another part of the volume is devoted to a paper read in 1882 by Gilbert Nash, secretary of the society, entitled "Weymouth in its first Twenty Years."

Attention should have been called some time ago to *Old Dartmouth Historical Sketches*, published by the Old Dartmouth (Mass.) Historical Society, nine of which have now appeared. They deal with local history and include "Gosnold and his Colony at Cuttyhunk," "Dartmouth Traditions," "King Philip's War in Dartmouth," and "Fairhaven in Four Wars."

In the series of vital records of Massachusetts towns, published by the New England Historic Genealogical Society, the volumes for Medway, Palmer, Newton, Charlton, and Oakham have appeared. The vital records of Boxford have been published by the Topsfield Historical Society.

The Old Colony Historical Society has recently published *Gov. Marcus Morton*, being the address by N. W. Littlefield delivered before the society at its annual meeting in January.

The Connecticut Valley Historical Society has published Volume II. of its *Papers and Proceedings*, covering the years 1882-1903. There are papers on the "Rev. Robert Breck Controversy," a church quarrel of 1734 over an early "higher critic," and on "The Irish Pioneers of the Connecticut Valley."

Volume X. of the *Collections of the Connecticut Historical Society*, which has recently been issued, is the second volume of "Rolls of Connecticut Men in the French and Indian War" published by the society for the state, under a special act of the Assembly. The years covered by the volume including the appendices are 1755-1764.

An attractive publication, privately printed for the New York chapter of the Colonial Order of the Acorn, is entitled *Early New York with Illustrative Sketches*, and consists of reproductions of six rare prints illustrative of New York between 1651 and 1801. Each print is accompanied by letter-press containing bibliographical and historical information.

The Debates and Proceedings of the Convention of the State of New York, June 17, 1788, is a reprint in facsimile of the complete report of the convention called to consider the ratification of the constitution.

Mr. Hugh Hastings, State Historian, continues the editing of the *Public Papers of George Clinton, First Governor of New York*. The strategic importance of New York during the period covered by Volume VII. of the series, June 1, 1781, to January 1, 1782, gives the letters and documents additional value. Volume VIII. leaves Revolutionary matters and includes papers dealing with affairs of peace.

The third volume of Dr. Morgan Dix's *History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York* covers the rectorate of Bishop Hobart, 1816-1830. It had been expected that the work would be completed in three volumes, but a fourth will be necessary.

Under the editorship of Frank H. Severance, the eighth volume of the *Publications of the Buffalo Historical Society* has appeared, marked by considerable variety in the character of its contents. The first 150 pages are profitably given up to the (University of Michigan) doctoral thesis of Orrin Edward Tiffany, bearing the title "The Relations of the United States to the Canadian Rebellion of 1837-1838". The purpose of the thesis, as stated by the author, is three-fold: to set forth the relation of the people in the border states to the Canadian revolutionists, describing the secret societies, their filibustering purposes and movements, and their political influence and effects; to make clear the policy of the Van Buren administration toward the violation of neutrality laws on the frontier; and finally to show the action of the border states respecting the conduct of their citizens, noting the conflict between state and federal authority, as illustrated in the McCleod case. The volume also contains a contribution to early lake history, the narrative of Captain William W. Dobbins, written from the papers and reminiscences of his father, Captain Daniel Dobbins. This narrative, portions

of which appeared in the *Buffalo Courier*, in 1876, has been amply edited by Mr. Severance. There is also a narrative of Colonel Samuel Blakeslee, written in 1822, dealing with his services in the Revolution, and in the defense of Buffalo in 1813. The concluding contribution is a series of reminiscences by the late Martha Fitch Poole on "Social Life in Earlier Buffalo".

In the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for July the letters from William Hamilton to his private secretary and from James H. Watmough to his wife are concluded. Most noteworthy of the new contributions are "The Log of Dr. Joseph Hinchman, Surgeon of the Privateer Brig Prince George, 1757," "Some Correspondence of Dr. James McHenry," "Rev. John Martin Mack's Narrative of a Visit to Onondaga in 1752," and two letters from John Paul Jones, both dated at L'Orient: one, of November 8, 1780, to Robert Morris, the other, of August 22, 1780, to William Carmichael.

Mr. Albert Cook Myers has in preparation a work dealing with the immigration of the English Quakers into Pennsylvania and New Jersey, which will serve as a companion work to his *Immigration of the Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania*. Mr. Myers is desirous of any documentary aid that may be offered.

A large contribution to the history of western Pennsylvania is Dr. Joseph H. Bausman's *History of Beaver County, Pennsylvania, and its Centennial Celebration*. The work is in two volumes, illustrated with portraits, maps, and facsimiles.

We have received a *History of the Newspapers of Beaver County, Pennsylvania*, by Frank S. Reader. This little volume contains a brief historical sketch of every newspaper that has been published in Beaver County, together with portraits of many persons connected with the county press.

In the July number of the *Publications of the Southern History Association*, D. M. De Witt's article on Vice-President Johnson and the documents bearing on the Texas revolution are concluded. An article on "Lafayette's Campaign in Virginia," by General M. J. Wright, is commenced and some selections from the correspondence of Senator J. R. Doolittle are printed.

The *South Atlantic Quarterly* for July contains several articles of historical interest: "The Fourteenth Amendment and Southern Representation," by James W. Garner; "Andrew Dickson White," by Charles H. Rammelkamp; "War Time in Alexandria, Virginia," by Miss S. L. Lee; "Blockade Running and Trade through the Lines into Alabama, 1861-1865," by Walter L. Fleming; and "The Executive Prerogative in the United States," by David Y. Thomas.

A *History of the General Assembly of Maryland, 1635-1904*, by Elihu S. Riley, has been published by Nunn and Company of Baltimore.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for July contains much original material of considerable interest. Selections from the proceedings of the colonial council, edited by Charles E. Kenper, throw light on the early westward movement in Virginia between 1724 and 1730, while the relations between Virginia and the Cherokees in 1768 and 1769 are illustrated by several documents including a letter from John Stuart, Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Southern Department, to John Blair; the treaty made at Fort Stanwix; instructions from Lord Botetourt to Colonel Lewis and Dr. Walker, respecting their mission to Stuart relative to the Cherokee boundary; and their report to Lord Botetourt, inclosing an account of their "talk" with the Cherokees. The instalment of "Virginia Legislative Papers" includes among other documents a Presbyterian protest of 1774 against a proposed toleration act, and the deposition of Dr. William Pasteur, physician to Lord Dunmore, relative to the removal of the powder from the Williamsburg magazine. From the papers of John A. Parker is printed a document entitled "How James Buchanan was made President of the U. S. and by whom," in which Buchanan's election is ascribed to the efforts in Virginia of Henry A. Wise and the writer. Finally should be noted a letter from John Paul Jones to Joseph Hewes, found among the Samuel Johnston papers at Edenton, North Carolina, dated New York, May 19, 1776, dealing with naval affairs generally and with the position of the writer in the navy.

The Library Board of the Virginia State Library has published the *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1773-6, including the Records of the Committee of Correspondence*, edited by Mr. John Pendleton Kennedy, Librarian. It is purposed to continue the publication of the Journal into earlier years.

The *Johns-Hopkins Studies* for July-August contain a new study in Virginia history, by O. P. Chitwood, under the title "Colonial Justice in Virginia". The writer has attempted to trace the growth of the entire system in Virginia, without entering into any elaborate review of legal proceedings. The work has been done with diligence and care, almost entirely from unpublished records of the county courts as preserved throughout Virginia.

The current number (Volume II., No. 1; June, 1905) of *The John P. Branch Historical Papers*, edited by Professor William E. Dodd of Randolph-Macon College, is devoted largely to the career of Spencer Roane. A biographical sketch, by Edwin J. Smith, is accompanied by reprints of public letters by Spencer Roane, which appeared in the *Richmond Chronicle* and the *Richmond Enquirer*. These include that signed "A Plain Dealer" of February 13, 1788, reprinted in Ford's *Essays on the Constitution*, and six letters of 1819 attacking the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *McCulloch v. Maryland*. Some dozen or more letters are also printed from Roane's correspondence, including letters to Monroe, Madison and William Roane, and two letters, hitherto

unpublished, from Jefferson dated June 28, 1818, and June 25, 1821. Finally mention should be made of Robert Kemp Morton's concluding paper on "Robert R. Livingston—Beginnings of American Diplomacy."

The Legislature of West Virginia at its last session established a State Bureau of History and Archives and withdrew the appropriation of the State Historical Society, which latter in consequence transferred its possessions to the new Bureau and suspended its *Historical Magazine* (now in its fifth volume).

Dr. S. B. Weeks announces that he has in preparation a definitive edition of his *Bibliography of North Carolina*. It will include all books, pamphlets, and articles in periodicals dealing with North Carolina or with North Carolinians, as well as a list of periodicals of all descriptions published within the state.

Under the direction of the secretary of state of North Carolina abstracts of the wills in his office are being prepared for publication. The wills number about four thousand, are mostly of dates between 1700 and 1750, and cover large areas of land in North Carolina and Tennessee.

A document of value in the study of the Moravian settlement of North Carolina is the "Diarium einer Reise von Bethlehem, Pa., nach Bethabara, N. C.", 1753, commencing in the *German American Annals* for August.

In *Collier's Weekly* for July 1 appeared what purported to be a facsimile of part of *The Cape Fear Mercury* for Friday, June 3, 1775, containing the "Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence," found by S. Millington Miller among the papers of Andrew Stevenson. Mr. A. S. Salley, Jr., in *The State*, of Columbia, S. C., for July 30, argues elaborately that the facsimile is not genuine. It is pointed out that the third of June, 1775, fell on Saturday instead of on Friday, etc. Mr. Salley's article also throws light on the development of the "Mecklenburg Declaration" myth, and is a distinct contribution to the literature of the subject.

Mr. A. S. Salley, Jr., has resumed the editorship of the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, a position which he resigned when he became secretary of the Historical Commission of South Carolina. The July number of the *Magazine* opens with a continuation of the Laurens correspondence consisting of one letter from Henry Laurens to his son, dated York Town, March 15, 1778, and three from John Laurens to his father, dated Headquarters, June 1, September 29, and October 23, 1778. The remainder of the number is made up of another instalment of the records of the Continental regiments from South Carolina, a brief sketch of John Alston, by the editor, "South Carolina Gleanings in England," and the usual "Historical Notes."

A catalogue of unusual value has lately been issued: *Books relating to the History of Georgia in the Library of Wymerley Jones De Renne*

of Wormsloe, Isle of Hope, Chatham County, Georgia. This sumptuous quarto of seventy-four pages was printed for Mr. De Renne for private distribution at the press of the *Savannah Morning News*. Many very rare and valuable books, pamphlets, maps, etc., relating to Georgia, are described; there are in all several thousand titles. The De Renne library is undoubtedly one of the finest of the special state collections in the country.

The eighth volume of the *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, edited by Franklin L. Riley, has come to hand. It contains the proceedings of the seventh annual meeting, held in January, 1904, and twenty-seven articles of varying value, many of considerable worth. Indians in Mississippi receive a large share of attention; a scholarly article displaying careful research on "Choctaw Land Claims," by Professor Riley, is followed by Mr. J. W. Wade's "The Removal of the Mississippi Choctaws," "Choctaw Traditions about their Settlement in Mississippi and the Origin of their Mounds," by Dr. Gideon Lincoff, and "Chickasaw Traditions, Customs, etc.", and "Some Chickasaw Chiefs and Prominent Men," both by Mr. Harry Warren. Following the custom of former years the volume contains a number of articles, some of the reminiscent type, dealing with Reconstruction in various counties. Of aid to users of the *Official Records of the Rebellion* will be General Stephen D. Lee's "Index to Campaigns, Battles and Skirmishes in Mississippi," while the important subject of "The Hampton Roads Conference" is treated by Hon. Frank Johnston. Two unpublished letters of Burton N. Harrison, relating to the attempts to secure the release of Jefferson Davis and to his actual liberation are especially noteworthy, as is also a brief article by Mr. William Beer on "Cartography of Mississippi in the Sixteenth Century."

In his third annual report as director of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Mr. Dunbar Rowland has included some interesting documentary material bearing on Burr's conspiracy.

The *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association for April is made up of an article by Miss Mattie Alice Austin on "The Municipal Government of San Fernando de Béxar, 1730-1800", a study, based on original research, of the organization and administration of the first and only purely civil community under Spanish rule in the province of Texas. Full and valuable bibliographical notes abound and much documentary material is appended.

Volumes XVI. and XVII. of the *Early Western Travels* complete the series of four volumes dealing with Long's expedition from Pittsburg to the Rocky Mountains in 1819-1820. Volume XVIII., which has just appeared, is a narrative by James O. Pattie of Kentucky covering six years of travel and dealing extensively with the various tribes of Indians.

The contents of the July number of *The "Old Northwest" Genealogical Quarterly* are mainly of genealogical interest; short biograph-

ical sketches of Dr. John Dawson, Dr. Jesse P. Judkins, W. H. Jennings, and Col. Frederick C. Pierce are included, while, as documentary material, is given in facsimile a letter from Major William Bradford, eldest son of Governor Bradford, dated Pocasset, June 30, 1676.

Biographical sketches together with the report of the twentieth annual meeting of the society make up the most important part of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* for July. Of the biographical articles there are four: "William Allen Trimble," by Mary McArthur Tuttle; "Caleb Atwater," by Clement L. Martzoff; "Tarhe the Wyandot Chief," by Dr. Charles E. Slocum, and "Colonel John O'Bannon," by Basil Meek.

Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society for the year 1904, appears as Publication No. 9 of the Illinois State Historical Library, a volume of some 700 pages. We mention a few of the many papers: "Illinois in the War of 1812-1814," by Frank E. Stevens; "A Trip from Pennsylvania to Illinois in 1851," by W. W. Davis; "Illinois Legislation on Slavery and Free Negroes, 1818-1865," by Mason McC. Fishback; "Illinois under the French, 1673-1765," by Stephen L. Spear, and "Forgotten Statesmen of Illinois," by J. F. Snyder.

Among the historical contributions in the latest volume of the *Proceedings* of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, should be noted "John Johnston: a Memoir," by William W. Wright; "Early Times in the Old Northwest," by Ira B. Branson; "Some Pioneering Experiences in Jefferson County," by Elbridge G. Fifield, and "Recollections of Antoine Grignon," by Eben D. Pierce.

The Minnesota Historical Society has removed its museum and library to the new and fireproof state capitol. The museum has recently been largely increased by the acquisition of the archaeological collections of the late Hon. J. R. Brower of St. Cloud and the Rev. Edward C. Mitchell of St. Paul.

The *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* for July contains three historical contributions: "The Coming of the Norwegians to Iowa," by George T. Flom; "The Bribery of Alexander W. McGregor" (a member of the legislature of Wisconsin Territory, in 1837-8), by John C. Parish, and "Illinois as a Constituency in 1850," a study of the situation in Illinois as regards national politics, by Allen Johnson.

The July number of *Annals of Iowa* contains "Recollections of the Old Capitol and the New," by Hon. Peter A. Dey; "Congressional Medals of Honor and Iowa Soldiers," by Col. Charles A. Clark; "The Simon Cameron Indian Commission of 1838," by Ida M. Street, and "Steam-boating on the Des Moines," by C. F. Davis.

The Missouri Historical Society will shortly publish additional material from the Spanish archives on the expedition of James Mackay up the Missouri river in 1794 and 1795.

Professor S. B. Harding's *Life of George R. Smith* (Sedalia, Mo., privately printed) is a contribution to the history of Missouri between 1840 and 1870. General Smith, known as the founder of Sedalia, was, although a slave-owner, an ardent Union man and was violently opposed to secession. At the beginning of the war he was adjutant-general of the provisional loyal government and had much to do with equipping the Union forces in the state. The Mormon war, slavery and the Kansas troubles, the Civil War and Reconstruction, all receive due attention and the correspondence of Mr. Smith throws considerable light on politics and affairs.

A History of the Pacific Northwest, by Joseph Schafer (Macmillan, pp. 321) is a compact account of the history of the territory covered by the states of Oregon, Washington and Idaho. Early voyages and explorations, the development of the fur trade, and the joint occupation by British and Americans receive the larger share of attention.

Under the auspices of the Oregon Historical Society an historical congress was held at Portland, August 21-23, in connection with the Lewis and Clark Exposition.

Dr. William A. Mowry has returned to the charge and in *Marcus Whitman and the Early Days of Oregon* (Silver, Burdett and Company) sets forth at length his already well known views respecting the relation of the missionary to the "saving" of Oregon.

A meeting at Toronto, May 17, 1905, resulted in calling into existence the Champlain Society, intended to perform for Canada functions like those of the Surtees, Hakluyt and Prince Societies. Mr. B. E. Walker, general manager of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, was provisionally made president; vice-presidents, Sir Louis A. Jetté, lieutenant-governor of the Province of Quebec, and Sir D. H. McMillan, lieutenant-governor of Manitoba; treasurer, Mr. James Bain of the Toronto Public Library; secretaries, Professors C. W. Colby of Montreal and G. M. Wrong of Toronto. The membership is limited to two hundred and fifty; the annual dues are ten dollars. It is expected that two volumes will be issued each year.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. F. Bandelier, *Traditions of Precolumbian Landings on the Western Coast of South America* (American Anthropologist, April-June); P. H. Woodward, *The True Story of the Regicides* (Connecticut Magazine, July-September); Victor Tantet, *Les Réfugiés Politiques Français en Amérique sous la Convention* (La Revue, August 1); L. de Norvins, *Les Bonaparte d'Amérique* (La Revue, July 15); G. P. Garrison, *Connecticut Pioneers Founded Anglo-American Texas* (Connecticut Magazine, July-September); J. S. Sewall, *With Perry in Japan* (Century, July); U. B. Phillips, *The Economic Cost of Slave-Holding* (Political Science Quarterly, June); W. G. Brown, *The Tenth Decade of the United States: III. Westward by Sea and Land; IV. Lincoln's Policy of Mercy* (Atlantic, July, Septem-

ber); T. A. Ashby, *Gen. R. E. Lee as a College President* (Confederate Veteran, August); M. A. De Wolfe Howe, editor, *Letters and Diaries of George Bancroft, I. Student Days in Europe* (Scribner's, September); C. H. Ambler, *Disfranchisement in West Virginia, II.* (Yale Review, August); W. L. Fleming, *Immigration to the Southern States* (Political Science Quarterly, June); O. S. Straus, *Historical Relations of Russia and the United States* (North American Review, August).

